

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, January, 1901.

DAS WORT SIE SOLLEN LASSEN STAHN UND KEIN DANCK DAZU HABEN.

FOR more than three centuries and a half Luther's *Ein feste burg ist unser Gott* has been the favorite hymn of Protestantism wherever German is spoken; it has been discussed by commentators, translated into numerous languages, and admired by lovers of poetry the world over; and until recently no one ever suggested that any part of it was in its wording obscure or ambiguous, or at variance with common usage. On the contrary, it was universally considered a model of clear, forcible and, in the best sense, popular diction; as Cyriacus Spangenberg, in the preface to his *Cithara Lutheri* (1569), said of Luther's hymns generally:

"Da ist nichts gezwungenes, nichts genöthigtes und eingeflicktes, nichts verdorbenes. Die Reimen sind leicht und gut, die Wort artlich und auserlesen, die Meinung klar und verständlich," etc.

It was in the year of the Luther jubilee, 1883, that new interpretations, especially of the first two lines in the fourth stanza, were first brought forward. Carl Schultz, in the *Nationalzeitung*, August 5, took "das wort" to mean "der Logos Jesus Christus;" but Theodor Maurer (*ibid.*, October 5), effectively defended the traditional interpretation 'the Gospel.' E. Krey (*Neue Stettiner Zeitung*, November 5), on the other hand, understood both "das wort" and "ein wörtlin" in the last line of the preceding stanza ("ein wörtlin kan yhn fellen") to refer to a particular passage of Scripture, namely, St. John, xvi, 8-11. The improbability of such an obscure allusion has been pointed out by Georg Runze, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 41 (1898), p. 446 f.; but this same scholar offers a far more extraordinary theory. He contends (*ibid.*, p. 412 ff.) that "das wort" cannot be the object of "lassen stahn" because the personal verb "sollen" does not precede the subject "sie," though Luther, who scanned (so Runze says) "Nehmén sié den leib," could

equally well have written "Das wórt sollén sie lássen stáhn (sic!); and he proposes, in all seriousness, to take "das wort" as in apposition with "ein wörtlin," to put a colon after "wort," and to read:

ein wörtlin kan yhn fellen,—

(namely) Das wort: "Sie sollen lassen stahn und kein danck dazu haben."

It is needless to comment upon the fatal defects of this theory; the worthlessness of the inference drawn from the word-order; the monstrousness of the scanning and of the proposed *enjambement*; the enigmatical nature of the alleged "word," which contains a transitive verb without an object and is, according to the context, obviously addressed, not to Satan at all, but to the human adversaries of Lutheranism; and finally, the resulting incoherence of the last stanza. Runze is aware (p. 422) that Luther often enough sacrificed word-order to rhythm: cf. "Eyn neues lied wir heben an,"—"Auf ihn mein herz soll lassen sich," etc.; and he admits that he himself is not fully convinced of the correctness of his conclusions; but he declares that his "psychische Intuition," and his "kritisches Gesamtgefühl" (p. 451) favor his interpretation. That is doubtless the root of his trouble; to appreciate songs written for the people by a man of the people, one needs nothing more than a healthy *Sprachgefühl*. To the popular mind the line "ein wörtlin kan yhn fellen" has always been perfectly clear and complete: "a single word (from the Lord) suffices to overthrow him." The same is true of the first line in the fourth stanza: "das wort," in this connection, is readily understood to be *das Wort Gottes*, the gospel as the foundation of the Lutheran doctrine.

It is the second line of the fourth stanza, however, that has been most frequently discussed and most variously interpreted. The first expression of dissent from the common view as to the meaning of "danck" came from Theodor Bach (*Nationalzeitung*, Aug. 3, 1883), who, adopting a suggestion made privately a number of years before by the theologian Oskar Jaenicke, held that *danck* was here used in its original sense of "cogitatio." But while

Jaenicke took the line to mean that "they (the adversaries of the Evangelical doctrine) were not even to think of assailing the gospel," Bach understood it to be directed, more specifically, against "menschliche Gedanken-zuthat zum Gotteswort." His arguments were refuted by Carl Schultz and Dr. Zweylinger (both in the *Nationalzeitung*, August 5, 1883), and by Theodor Maurer (*ibid.*, October 5), all of whom adduced, besides, new evidence in favor of the traditional interpretation. It was a matter of surprise, therefore, that Heyne in his *Wörterbuch I* (1890), col. 540, quoted our passage as an illustration of the use of *danck* in the sense of 'inclination, intention, volition.' According to Dietz, *Luther-Wörterbuch I*, 394 f., this use of the word is restricted in Luther's works to the set phrases *ohn danck* (*ohn yhren danck* = against their inclination) and *zu danck*; outside of these stereotyped locutions, which are relics of an earlier usage, Luther never employs the singular *danck* in any other sense than that of 'thanks.' In this primarily abstract sense the word could of course not be pluralized; the plural form (usually not, as in MHG., *denke*, but weak: *dancken*) thus remained available, without danger of ambiguity, for the expression of its primitive meaning 'thoughts,' and Luther so uses it occasionally, in place of the derivative *gedanken*. It is apparent that its occurrence in this sense does not, in itself, warrant any inferences as to the singular, the conditions being essentially different. The verb *denken*, to be sure, sometimes has in Luther's language the force of 'wishing,' 'intending;' but in all such cases Luther construes it with the preposition *nach* ("etlich die nicht darnach denken, kriegen das haus voll kinder" Dietz I, 423), while he ordinarily uses *an*, *über*, *von*, just as we do now. Heyne, however, in paraphrasing "danck dazu haben" by "es gern thun wollen," connects "danck" with "dazu,"—a construction which is without a parallel in Luther's works or anywhere else.

Apart from these linguistic considerations, the meaning which Heyne's interpretation of "danck" gives to the line "und (sie sollen) kein danck dazu haben" ("and they shall not do it willingly") is in itself unsatisfactory:

whether we take the "shall" as expressing a demand (or command) or as referring to a divine decree, it is not credible that Luther should have either wished or predicted that his enemies would be unwilling ever to leave his doctrine in peace. For evidence on this point we should turn to his pamphlet *Von heimlichen und gestolen brieffen* (1529), written in reply to an attack from Duke George of Saxony during the same controversy and amid the same threatening situation which, as now seems certain (cf. H. Biltz, *Herrigs Archiv* lxxv, p. 45 ff.), gave rise to our hymn. There we find various pertinent passages, of which the following (Erlangen edition xxxi, pp. 22 and 28) are particularly to the point:

"Endlich ist noch mein unterthänige Bitte an Herzog Georgen und allen seinen Anhang, sie wollten einmal authören, und unsere Lehre mit Frieden lassen . . . Begehren wir doch nicht mehr, denn Friede und stille zu sein . . ."

And in the prayer at the end:

"Lass der Gottlosen Bosheit ein Ende werden . . . Wollen sie nicht aufhören, so schaffe, dass sie müssen aufhören mit ihrem Wüthen und Verfolgen, und bestätige unser Lehre und Thun . . . Ich weiss, dass du mich vertheidigen wirst, und unser Lehre beschirmen, und sollten die Tyrannen bersten und toll werden."

A peculiar suggestion came, in 1893, from R. Sprenger (*Zeitschrift für den deutschen Unterricht*, vii, 683 f.), who wanted to take "danck" in the sense of 'Turnierdank, Siegespreis.' The incongruity of this view was pointed out by R. Hildebrand (*ibid.* vii, 787 f.) who had already in the *DWb.* iv (1878), 1, 1942 declared himself in favor of the common interpretation of our line: "wir danken ihnen gar nicht dafür," adding, however, that in this case the meaning 'thanks' had usurped the place of the meaning 'intention, will.' But there does not appear to be any reason for assuming such a substitution. From the time of our earliest records, 'thanks' was the regular meaning of the word; the only exceptions from this rule are, in OHG., the adverbial genitive *thankes* = 'voluntarily,' and in MHG. a few scattered cases of the use of *danc* in the sense of 'thought,' 'inclination,' 'intention,' besides certain fixed prepositional phrases like *âne danc* (Luther's *ohn danck*); the presumption as to "danck" in our passage is

therefore strongly in favor of 'thanks,' and this meaning, moreover, fits the context to perfection. Hildebrand had in mind the fact that the statement "they shall not even receive thanks for it" implies that "they *must* do it, *willingly or unwillingly*;" but his theory as to the antecedents of the phrase would, like Heyne's view, remove this very essential alternative and substitute the certainty, nay, the necessity (!) of unwillingness. It is sufficient, however, that he agrees to the common interpretation of our line as it stands; a fact which was overlooked by Karl Scheffler, who, in the *Zeitschrift des allgemeinen deutschen Sprachvereins* viii (1893), col. 33 ff., thought it necessary to defend the traditional view (with the modification proposed by him: *danck = Lohn*) against both Heyne and Hildebrand.

After Scheffler's article the controversy rested until quite recently, when Paul Pietsch, in the first issue of Kluge's *Zeitschrift für deutsche Wortforschung*, p. 26 ff., made an attempt to revive the earliest of the dissenting interpretations, that of Oskar Jänicke (*danck* = 'thought'). It would not be worth while to discuss this view again, if it were not now advocated by so prominent a scholar as the editor-in-chief of the new standard edition of Luther's works. Pietsch, it seems, was converted to this view long ago by Fedor Bech, who called his attention to certain parallel passages (cf. Pietsch, p. 27) bearing, as he thought, upon the line under discussion. Let us see what they are and what evidence they furnish.

1. "das ich des habe deheinen danc," Ulrich von Eschenbach's *Alexander*, 6480, and similarly 22680. Bech might also have mentioned *Wigalois* 6466 and Burcard Waldis, *Esopus*, I, 66, 26. These are the only instances recorded in our dictionaries of the use of *danc haben* with the genitive in the sense of 'to think of,' 'to imagine, suppose,' over against the very common occurrence of the phrase, from the OHG. period till long after Luther, as meaning 'to receive thanks, recognition, for' (cf. Luther's poem *Fraw Musica*, line 32: "des [for its song] mus sie [the nightingale] haben jmer danck," and many similar passages).

Bech's quotations, therefore, only emphasize the exceptional nature of such cases.

2. "sine denke da zu legen = *seine Gedanken darauf richten, Leben der hl. Elisabeth*, 4458. This is intended to show the use of *dazu* in connection with *dank*; but "da zu" here modifies "legen," not "denke," and is due solely to the use of this verb.

3. "dar hadden des koninges rād danken tō," Magdeburger Schöffenchronik, 301, 18; explained in the glossary as meaning "dabei hatten des Königs Räte Gedanken, waren misstrauisch." I am not able to verify this passage, and therefore cannot say whether "danken" is there construed with "tō," or whether, as the translation seems to imply, "dar tō" is simply an adverb.

Pietsch realized that his theory needed the support of "a Luther passage in which the phrase (*kein danck dazu haben*) was used in exactly the same sense as in the verse in question." Such a passage, he thinks, he has found in the pamphlet above referred to, where on p. 17 Luther says:

"Nu soll mir Herzog George die Freiheit lassen, dass ich ihn heimlich (that is, privately) urtheile, mit Gedanken, Schriften, Reden, wie ichs für Gott weiss zu verantworten, und solls keinen Dank dazu haben; grobelt er aber darnach hinter meinem Wissen und Willen, und lässt mirs abstehlen, und findet alsdenn, das ihn verdreusht, so hab ers ihm, und ein gut Jahr dazu," etc.

Pietsch declares that "keinen dank dazu haben" and "grobelt er" are antithetic; that the first-mentioned phrase, therefore, must express the opposite of *grobelt*, and that Luther must have meant to say:

"und er soll darauf keinen Gedanken verwenden; thut er das letztere aber, indem er hinter meinem Rücken ihnen nachspürt," etc.

Consequently, he argues, we may consider it as *gesichert* that the two lines in our hymn mean:

"Das Wort sollen sie stehen lassen und kein darauf gerichtetes Denken haben, d.h. sie sollen es weder äusserlich noch auch nur innerlich mit ihren Gedanken antasten."

To all appearances Pietsch fails to perceive that his interpretation would make Luther guilty of a flagrant inconsistency. It is hardly credible that Luther should have uttered such a sentiment at or about the very time when he

was writing a pamphlet in defence of freedom of thought and even of speech in private intercourse, a pamphlet in which he reminds his adversary that "Gedanken sind zollfrei," and denounces him for his "Moabitic conceit and arrogance," in forbidding others to think or privately say or write of him anything he did not approve; still less can we believe that he should have stultified himself by expressing such a sentiment in that very pamphlet, of all places—nay, in the same breath with a declaration to the effect that he considers himself responsible for his thoughts to God alone.

An examination of Pietsch's argument reveals several fundamental errors. In the first place there is no reason whatever for assuming that "grobelt er" is in antithesis with that particular phrase "keinen danck dazu haben;" the passage, as a whole, falls logically as well as syntactically into two parts, the point of division being marked by the semicolon after "haben" (Erl. ed.), or rather, in the original text as quoted by Pietsch, by the capital G of "Grobelt;" the *aber* of the second part, therefore, indicates an antithesis between the two parts as units, more particularly between the leading ideas in them, that is, the "Freiheit lassen," and the "grobeln" and "abstehlen;" and this antithesis is perfectly obvious, for such acts as are denoted by the last-mentioned verbs could only serve (and had already served) the purpose of interfering with the *Freiheit* referred to.

Furthermore, in treating *nachspüren* and *Gedanken verwenden auf* as synonymous, Pietsch simply begs the question. In the pamphlet from which the passage is taken, the words *grobeln* and *ergrobeln* occur each four times, and the situation there discussed leaves no doubt as to their meaning. Duke George had pried into Luther's private correspondence by securing, in an underhanded manner, a copy of a letter in which Luther had severely criticized him, and by using every means in his power to secure the original also; and that is what the *grobeln* in the pamphlet invariably refers to: "grobelt, sucht und fodert die Handschrift," p. 10; "nach frembden Briefen grobeln," p. 16; "ergrobeln und erfahren," "heimliche Briefe und Reed ergrobeln," p. 18; "auf dass er nicht abermal Diebe ausschicken musse, die solch mein

Gebet heimlich ergrobeln und stehlen," p. 25; etc. This meaning of *grobeln*, which prevailed as late as the seventeenth century (cf. Hensch, as quoted by Heyne, *Wb.* I, 1260: "grübeln, nachforschen, erkundigen,") has in it a distinct suggestion of the primitive sense of "digging, grubbing," as is also evidenced by the use of the preposition *nach* and (in other places) *in*, and by the frequent juxtaposition of *grobeln* and *suchen*; it stands midway between the original meaning and the modern one of "pondering, brooding" as restricted to mental activity; the latter would be wholly out of place in our passage and everywhere else in the pamphlet. Pietsch's conclusion as to the force of "keinen danck dazu haben," would, therefore, be unwarranted, even if this phrase were in antithesis with "grobelt er."

The *s* appended to *soll* is another obstacle in Pietsch's way. He admits that it can only be the genitive *es* dependent upon "danck;" but according to his theory the thing thought of is already indicated by "dazu." "However, such an *überflüssiges s*," he says, "is not uncommon with Luther; the most similar case is: 'das yhrs solchs bitten mit aller zuversicht thutt;' compare also 'Du sollst mirs thun.'" As a matter of fact, the first of these two quotations shows the common phenomenon of anticipation of the object by means of *es*: *dass ihr es, dieses Beten* (the aforesaid praying), *mit aller Zuversicht thut*; the words "solchs bitten," are, in effect, merely explanatory of *es*, and can be omitted entirely.

The other quotation is an instance of simple pleonasm, in the repetition of the syncopated enclitic *es*; Luther expressly defends this usage, adding, however, that without syncopé the phrase would be a "barbarus Germanismus" ("undeutsches Deutsch," as it has been aptly rendered).

It is obvious that neither of these two passages is at all analogous, in the use of *es*, to "solls keinen danck dazu haben." The other cases of "überflüssiges *s*" which Pietsch has in mind are doubtless those recorded by him in two footnotes of the Weimar edition (xiv, p. 237, and xv, p. 77); there are six in all, three of them being pleonastic repetitions B: ("wo es mirs fehlt;" "habens sies gelestert;" "es nichts ists;" the last two do not occur in the first editions and are probably corruptions)

while the other three ("er wirts sie" [wird sie]; "verkauff mirs sy;" "kann mans sie") are most likely due to attraction, though they may be pleonastic too (anticipation of the object *sie* in an apocopated enclitic form). Here again, there is not a single parallel to the passage in question; in fact, a pleonasm of the kind that Pietsch assumes is simply impossible: the simultaneous expression of one and the same logical relation ('thought of a thing') by both the genitive case and a prepositional phrase would be a syntactical monstrosity. If, then, as Pietsch admits, the enclitic *s* of "solls" is the genitive *es* dependent upon "danck," it follows that the word "dazu" cannot be anything but an adverbial modifier of the predicate, and as such it must mean "in addition thereto, besides, moreover." This conclusion disposes, at the same time, of the only argument which Pietsch advances against the common interpretation of the line in the hymn "und kein danck dazu haben;" he insists that if "dazu" meant "moreover," it would stand either at the beginning or at the end of the phrase, not in the middle. The fact is that the order of words to which he objects occurs not only in his own quotation, but as we shall see, elsewhere, too; in the particular locution under discussion, it seems to have been the rule. It is to be observed, moreover, that Pietsch is curiously inconsistent in this matter; he rejects the common interpretation on the ground that it presupposes an unusual order of words, but he does not hesitate to offer, in its stead, a theory that postulates two striking exceptions: a use of *danck* which is not found anywhere else in Luther's works, and a syntactical construction (*danck zu*) which is absolutely unheard of in German literature.

In dealing with the mass of evidence which favors the traditional view, Pietsch proceeds in a rather arbitrary fashion. Cochläus' version (1529) of the passage in the pamphlet: "ac ne gratiam quidem eo nomine ullam a me inibit," a strikingly careful rendering (*quidem* = "dazu," *enomine* = "es") by a man who was thoroughly familiar with Luther's style and diction, would seem to leave no room for doubt as to Luther's meaning; but Pietsch sweeps it aside with the remark that Coch-

läus' home was so far from Wittenberg (he was born near Nürnberg, had studied at Cologne, had then lived at Frankfurt and Mainz, and in 1529 was residing at Dresden) that he "could not be considered a reliable interpreter of an expression of Luther's which was evidently not widely used": in other words, he assumes that within a certain radius from Wittenberg the word *danck*, in the phrase under discussion, meant 'thought,' but that everywhere else in Germany it meant 'thanks'! It is interesting to recall, in this connection, the testimony of Dr. Zweylinger (*Nationalzeitung*, August 5, 1883), to the effect that in the Province of Saxony (where Wittenberg is situated) the locution in question is used to this day in the sense disputed by Pietsch: "Datô (dazu, dafür) saste (sollst du) keenen Dank hemm'n (haben)" = "Dafür werde ich dir nicht noch extra eine Lobrede halten." But of this fact Pietsch takes no notice.

It is needless to dwell on this subject. If further evidence is wanted as to the correctness of the traditional interpretation of the line in our hymn, it will be found in a parallel passage which Pietsch has overlooked,—strangely enough, for it is in the very pamphlet from which he derives the supposed corroboration of his theory. On page 11 (Erl. ed.) of that pamphlet, Luther contends that a charge of libel cannot be based upon a private letter, on the principle that "De occultis non judicat Ecclesia, multo minus judicat de eisdem Magistratus," and concludes by saying (p. 12), with reference to the "Hofeschränzen zu Dresen:" "Sie sollen mir heimliche Sachen ungericht lassen, und dess keinen Dank dazu haben." There cannot be any doubt as to either the syntactical structure or the meaning of this passage. "Dank" is unmistakably construed with the genitive, not with *zu*; "dazu" can only be an adverbial modifier in the sense of 'moreover,' and its position shows again the invalidity of Pietsch's objection on this score; and as "dess" refers to "ungericht lassen," "Dank" cannot possibly mean 'thought.'

Now all this must apply as well to the pas-

¹ If Zweylinger's interpretation of *datô* is correct, it shows that this word, in taking the place, at the head of the sentence, of the disused genitive dependent upon *Dank*, has also, in a measure, assumed the function of this genitive.

sage quoted by Pietsch and to the disputed line in the hymn, for the three cases are in every respect analogous. The line in the hymn, to be sure, lacks the genitive *des* or *es*, but the reason is obvious; there was not room for another word, nor could an enclitic's be appended to "und;" and the genitive could be spared, as the sentence was clear enough without it. The objections to Heyne's view (*danck=Wille*) have been stated above; there remains, then, for our "danck" only its ordinary meaning, in whose favor Luther's usage establishes *a priori* the strongest kind of presumption, and which, moreover, makes excellent sense in all three passages: Luther declares that he will not even thank his enemies for complying with his demand, inasmuch as he is merely asserting rights and truths which they will have to recognize sooner or later, willingly or unwillingly (cf. Zweylinger and Maurer, II. cc.). That is what the early translators of the hymn had in mind when they rendered our lines, freely but the more tersely and pointedly, by

"Verbum hoc adversariis nobis non eripient
Sed quantumvis inviti relinquent" (Sleidanus, 1546)
"Purum sinant verbum Dei
Nolint velint quique" (Ammon, 1579).
"Nobis furor verbum Dei
Noluit, velit, relinquit" (Cremcovius).

The train of thought and the tone and spirit of our lines as thus interpreted are thoroughly characteristic of Luther. A perfect counterpart of them, furnishing in the explicitness of its wording a welcome commentary on the disputed line in the hymn and on its parallel passages, is to be found in the open letter *An die Herren deutschs Ordens* (1523). In this letter Luther contrasts the true chastity of matrimony with the false one of celibacy, and urges the knights of the Teutonic Order to marry, adding, with reference to the decrees of popes and ecclesiastical councils (Weimar ed. xii, p. 238):

"Und obs uns die Concilia und menschen
hynfurt erleubten und zu liessen, so wollen
wyr yhr urlaub nicht haben, und umb yhrs
zulassens willen nichts widder thun noch las-
sen. Denn *ich will nicht gnug daran haben*,
das Concilia odder kirche (wiesie es deuten)
solchs zu lassen oder setzen, *Ich wils yhn auch*
keynen danck nicht wissen, noch sie drum

*grüssen, noch von yhn begeren. Sie sollens
und müssens thun"*...

And further, p. 239:

"Sie sollen zu schanden werden öffentlich,
wie Paulus sagt 2. Timo. 2., *es geschehe wil-
liglich oder unwilliglich*, des und keyn anders,
wenn yhr noch zehen mal so viel weren, und
eyn iglicher so viel vermöcht, als sie itzt alle
samt vermügen."

HUGO K. SCHILLING.

Harvard University.

INACCURACIES IN *EUGÉNIE GRANDET*.

A FEW years ago it was noticed that increased attention was being given to Balzac in this country. At present the enthusiasm for the author is very marked. All evidences go to show that, in the words of a recent essayist, "Balzac is just now in the zenith of his fame in America." In France the centenary celebration held at Tours in May, 1899, and a new illustrated edition of his works, now in course of publication, are some of the indications of a willingness to acknowledge the novelist's supremacy in his own country. Recent French art, too, has been quick to reflect the same feeling.

In 1895, an American edition of *Eugénie Grandet* (ed. Bergeron) was published by Henry Holt & Co., and reviewed briefly in this journal.¹ This edition, though far from perfect, has done much to stimulate the study of Balzac in our college classrooms, and has called forth in the columns of this journal several communications in the way of comment and elucidation.² The object here is to discuss some additional points touching the text of Balzac's masterpiece. The inaccuracies to be noted are not all, in themselves, matters of vital importance; they are perhaps inseparable from the peculiar genius and bulky product of the author. But it is thought that they should be of immediate interest to teachers who include Balzac in their courses. The page references are to the Holt edition, and

1. Vol. xi, June, 1896, col. 380.

2. Vol. xii, June, 1897, col. 321; Vol. xiii, Mar. 1898, col. 191; Vol. xiii, May, 1898, col. 320; Vol. xiv, Feb. 1899, col. 128.

the readings in question correspond in all cases to those of the "édition définitive" of Calmann Lévy.

Most noticeably is Balzac inaccurate in his chronology. In his statements regarding the ages of three of his principal characters, M. Grandet, Eugénie and la grande Nanon, he has two sets of incongruous dates; one set for the early expository pages of the story, and another introduced towards the close, when he has evidently become forgetful or careless, and has failed to adjust carefully his facts and figures to his former scheme. In giving the biography of M. Grandet, it is stated on p. 5, ll. 31-32, that at the outbreak of the Revolution, or shortly afterwards, the miser was forty years old; and again, about a page later (p. 7, ll. 3-4,) it is said that in 1806 his age was fifty-seven. These two statements harmonize fairly well. Much later in the book, when the question of Grandet's age is again discussed, we read (p. 192, ll. 10-11): "Grandet commençait alors sa soixante-seizième année." The time referred to here is, as indicated by the context, the spring or early summer of 1820. And a few pages farther on, where the author is dealing with the events of the year 1827, the text runs (p. 201, l. 33-p. 202, l. 3): "Puis, vers la fin de cette année, le bonhomme fut enfin à l'âge de quatre-vingt-deux ans, pris par une paralysie qui fit de rapides progrès." These last two statements also agree, but they fail, by a margin of four years, to harmonize with the earlier reckoning. If Grandet was fifty-seven years old in 1806, his age in 1827 must have been seventy-eight, instead of eighty-two.

Similar inaccuracies of statement are found in the passages which refer to the age of the servant Nanon. She had entered the service of Grandet at the age of twenty-two (p. 21, l. 10, *seq.*), and has been with him for thirty-five years (p. 20, l. 31-p. 21, l. 1) when the action of the story opens in 1819. At this date then she was fifty-seven years old. On page 205, where the circumstances of her marriage are narrated, the age assigned to her is fifty-nine (ll. 17-19: "Quoiqu'elle eût cinquante-neuf ans, elle ne paraissait pas en avoir plus de quarante"). This marriage took place very soon after the miser's death, which had oc-

curred not earlier than the close of 1827. Consequently there must be a discrepancy here of at least six years. Nanon's age at her marriage should be not less than sixty-five. It may be added that Balzac applies the epithet "sexagénaire" to Nanon (p. 21, l. 8) at a time when, according to his reckoning, she was not more than fifty-seven. Further, it is alleged in the course of Nanon's biography, that in the year 1811 she had been in the miser's employ for twenty years. The text reads (p. 22, ll. 10-12): "Lors de la fameuse année 1811, dont la récolte coûta des peines inouïes, après vingt ans de service, Grandet résolut de donner sa vieille montre à Nanon." This statement is wide of the truth by several years; for it has been insisted on the previous page, and is urged again on the following one, that her period of service had covered thirty-five years; and all of this was prior to the beginning of the action of the story in 1819. Hence, in 1811, she must have been with Grandet for about twenty-seven years.

Eugénie's age at the opening of the story is twenty-three. "Elle a vingt-trois ans aujourd'hui, l'enfant," says her father (p. 26, l. 20). This is at the middle of the month of November, 1819. Just after the miser's death and the marriage of Nanon, a reference to the age of the heroine (p. 206, l. 25), puts it at thirty years. This is evidently in the early days of 1828; it cannot be before the close of 1827. Here again Balzac is inexact. At the death of her father Eugénie must have been thirty-one. On page 175, where the time is New Year's day, 1820, Eugénie, in resisting her father's demands for the collection of gold coins which he had given her, calls his attention to the fact that she is of age, and says: "j'ai vingt-deux ans" (l. 16). This is a mere slip; ten pages later (p. 186, l. 25) her right age, twenty-three, is again given. But the reading is retained in the Lévy edition, though it has been corrected in the English version by Miss Wormeley.

Connected with Grandet's death and the references to Eugénie's age, are the questions of the duration of her passion for Charles and the date of his return to France. Charles had left Saumur towards the end of the year 1819. The death of the miser occurred eight

years later, after which Eugénie was left alone to brood over her love and to face the flatteries of her scheming admirers. In the course of a few pages, descriptive of her condition during these early months of 1828, Balzac refers to the period that had intervened, now as seven years, now as eight. On page 207, ll. 21-22, is the sentence: "Depuis sept ans, sa passion avait tout envahi." This should rather be eight years, since from the very next day after the departure of Charles her love had begun to pervade all her thoughts (cf. p. 165, ll. 5-8). And only a page later (p. 208, l. 28) the interval is correctly referred to as eight years. Again on p. 211, ll. 4-5, Eugénie exclaims to Nanon: "Comment, . . . il ne m'écrit pas une fois en sept ans!" She had not heard from him for over eight years. In describing, farther on, the events which took place some months later in the same year (1828), Balzac says: "Le drame commencé depuis neuf ans se dénouait" (p. 228, ll. 2-3). As to Charles, the author makes him return to France in June, 1827 (p. 212, l. 30, and p. 214, l. 16). This is a year too soon. His letter to Eugénie, written a month after his arrival at Paris, and received by her at the beginning of the month of August following the death of her father, points to the year 1828. A similar discrepancy occurs in the course of the letter itself, when the writer speaks (p. 220, ll. 22-23) of having been absent seven years ("après sept années d'absence").

In the passages dealing with the interval between the departure of Charles and the tragic first of January following, occur time references which are inaccurate. Charles had arrived at Saumur in the middle of November. His visit there was not a long one, just how long Balzac does not state. But the events of his stay, with the preparations for his voyage to Java, must have consumed at least two or three weeks, so that it is fair to conclude that he left not earlier than the first of December. There could be but a month or less to elapse before New Year's day, 1820. Balzac puts this interval at two months (p. 165, l. 26 and elsewhere). Further, in noting the incidents of a conversation which was taking place, on a Sunday morning just before the close of the year, between Eugénie and her mother, the author says (p. 166, ll. 11-12): "Dans trois

jours, l'année 1819 finissait." And on the next page (ll. 4-6), before the same conversation has ended, Eugénie is made to say: "Demain matin, ne devons-nous pas aller lui souhaiter la bonne année dans sa chambre" (referring to her father). There is an evident carelessness in these statements.

In the opening paragraph of the story proper (pp. 24-25), there is an apparent confusion regarding the two fêtes of birthday and saint's day. The time is the middle of November, and it is Eugénie's birthday. The lines in question read (p. 25, l. 9, *seq.*):

"Le matin, M. Grandet, suivant sa coutume pour les jours mémorables de la naissance et de la fête d'Eugénie, était venu la surprendre au lit, et lui avait solennellement offert son présent paternel . . . Madame Grandet donnait ordinairement à sa fille une robe d'hiver ou d'été, selon la circonstance. Ces deux robes," etc.

From this it seems clear that there must be a question of two days, and that one of them is in the summer. But the day of Sainte Eugénie is now November 15, and, as far as I have been able to discover, it was not in the summer season at the time of the author's story. This makes it appear that the two days are the same, and that Balzac is faulty in his adjustment of them.

Aside from these questions of days and dates, there are in *Eugénie Grandet* other passages in which the author's reckoning and money calculations are open to suspicion. A detailed study of these matters would carry this discussion too far. It may be suggested only that the statements on page 74, about the amount and value of hay to be raised on an area of land formerly occupied by poplar trees, are blind and unsatisfactory; also that the figures dealing with the liabilities of M. Grandet of Paris, and with the savings of Nanon are not always consistent.

B. L. BOWEN.

Ohio State University.

SOME DERIVED MEANINGS.

I

1. Scotch *tine* 'lose,' ME. *tine* 'trouble, distress,' OE. *tēona* 'injury, suffering, injustice, insult,' *tieman* 'annoy, irritate, revile,' OS

tiono 'hostility, injustice,' ON. *tjōn* 'loss, injury,' *tyna* 'lose, destroy,' *tynask* 'pass away, die, be ruined' are from a base **deu-no*-, **dū-no*-, and should therefore not be compared with Skt. *dunōti*, Gk. *δαίω* 'burn,' root **dāyo*-.

They belong rather to the root *deyo*- 'lack, fail, miss' in Gk. *δενύμαι* 'lack, want,' *δέομαι* 'want, need, ask,' Skt. *dōṣa-s* 'fehler, schaden, mangel,' *duṣ-* 'ill-, mis-', *dūṣyati* 'verdirbt, wird schlecht,' etc. For other related words see Uhlenbeck, *Ai. Wb.* To these add the following:

2. E. *tire*, OE. *týran*, *tēorian* 'fail, fall short; be tired; tire' are from a Germ. base **tūza*-, **teuza*-, (with which compare Skt. *dōṣa-s* 'fehler, schaden, mangel,' etc.) which is congeneric with Goth. *tuz-*, ON., OE. *tor-*, OHG. *zur-*, Gk. *δύσ-*, etc.

The root *deu*- 'lack, fail, fall short of' is identical with *deu*- 'distant, separated,' and with *deu*- 'press forward, move rapidly onward or away.' We may illustrate the development of the root as follows: Lith. *dėvyju* 'set in rapid motion,' MHG. *zouwe* 'eile,' *zouwic* 'rührig, tätig,' MG. *zūwen* 'sich eilig vorwärts bewegen,' Skt. *duvās* 'hinausstrebend,' *daviyāms* 'recht fern,' *dūrās* 'fern': OE, *tēorian* 'fall short of, fail,' primarily 'be distant from,' Skt. *dōṣas* 'fehler, mangel, schaden,' etc.

This gives but one ne of development. Another, which is even more closely connected with the primary meaning, is 'set in motion, drive, pull, draw, lead,' etc. Here we have MHG. *zouwe* 'eile,' *zouwen* 'von staten gehen, gelingen; eilig ziehen, marschieren, eilig sein, eilen, sich beeilen': MDu. *touwen* 'agitare, premere, pressare'; E. *touse*, *tousle*, *tussle*, LG. *tūsen*, OHG. *-zūsen* 'zausen'; ON. *tūta* 'anything projecting,' *tutla* 'pull, pluck,' OE. *topp* 'top,' OHG. *zopf*, NHG. *zupfen*, pre-Germ. base **dubno*- 'wave, swing, jerk,' with which compare Lat. *dubius* 'waver-ing'; Skt. *dōlā* 'schaukel,' *dōlāyatē* 'schaukelt, schwankt,' Lat. *duellum*, *bellum* 'war,' OHG. *zweilga* 'zweig'; OHG. *ziohan* 'ziehen, sich begeben; ziehen, führen, richten,' *zogōn* 'gehen, eilen; ziehen, zerren, reißen, raufen,' Lat. *dūcō*, etc. (Cf. Schade, *Wb.*, Webster's *Dict.*, Indo-Germ. Roots, 64.)

Compare now the following: ON. *tjōn* 'loss,

injury,' OE. *tēona* 'injury, suffering; injustice, wrong; insult, contumely; quarrel,' *tēonian* 'irritate; calumniate,' *tienan* 'annoy, irritate; revile, calumniate': *tēorian* 'fail, fall short of; be tired; tire,' Skt. *dōṣa-s* 'fehler, sünde, schuld, schlechtigkeit, mangel, schaden, nachteil, übelstand,' *dūṣyati* 'verderben, schlecht machen, verunglimpfen, tadeln, schänden, beschimpfen,' OHG. *-zūsen* 'zausen.'

3. OE. *tiedre* 'weak, frail, having bad health, fleeting, transitory,' *tiedran* 'become weak, be perishable, decay' may be compared with NHG. *zaudern*, and also with OHG. *zota* 'zotte,' MHG. *zoten* 'langsam gehen,' and all referred to the root *deu*- in the above. Here also we may add OHG. *ziotar*, ON. *tjōðr* 'tether,' *tjōðra* 'tie, tether,' NHG. prov. *tüdern*. However different in meaning, they are all derivable from a common base **deu-to*-, *du-to*-, etc. Compare the similar change in meaning in NHG. *ziehen*, *zögern*, *zügel*, E. *tug*, OE. *tēag* 'bond, chain,' *tiegan* 'tie,' etc.

To the same root if not to the same stem belong OE. *tūdor* 'progeny, fruit,' *tydran* 'bring forth; breed; cultivate.' Compare OHG. *zuht* 'ziehen, zug: nachkommenschaft'; *zoum* 'zaum': OE. *tēam* 'progeny, race.' So we may compare ON. *tjōðr* 'tether': OE. *tūdor* 'progeny.'

4. OHG. *zūn* 'zaun,' OS. *tūn* 'fence, garden,' ON. *tūn* 'enclosed place, yard,' OE. *tūn* 'enclosed place, yard, garden, farm, town,' *týnan* 'enclose, fence; shut, close,' OIr. *dún* 'town' are from a base *dūno*- 'enclosing, enclosed.' This base I derive from the root *deu*- 'pull, draw, draw together.' Compare Goth. *tiuhan* 'ziehen,' OE. *tēon* 'draw, drag, pull,' *tēag* 'bond, chain, tape; case, casket; enclosure, paddock,' *tiegan* 'tie, connect,' ON. *taug* 'rope.'

The development in meaning 'pull, twist, fasten, tie, enclose' is quite natural and not uncommon. So: OHG. *liohhan* 'pull, wrestle,' OE. *lucan* 'pull up, join together, interlace, close, confine,' *loc* 'lock, bolt; anything shut in, prison, stronghold, sheepfold, settlement'; Lith. *veriti* 'open and close,' primarily 'turn,' Skt. *vr̥ṇōti* 'enclose, surround, cover,' *vr̥ti-s* 'fence, hedge': OE. *worþ* 'enclosure, courtyard, farm'; Lat. *vergō* 'bend, turn,'

Skt. *vrñākti* 'bend, twist,' *vrñāna-m* 'enclosure, community,' *vrñā-s* 'fence, hurdle, stall' (cf. Uhlenbeck, *Ai. Wb.* s. v.); Lith. *ritū* 'roll, turn,' OE. *wripan* 'twist; bind,' *wrēd* 'band, wreath,' *wripels* 'band' (cf. Lidén *Ein Baltisch-Slav. Anlautgesetz*, 4).

Now since we have the meaning 'draw, pull' in *ziehen*, *zausen*, *zupfen*, ON. *tutla*, we are justified in assuming a root *deu-* 'pull, draw.' This would be the natural outgrowth of 'move rapidly.' We might expect, therefore, from MHG. *zouwen* 'eilig ziehen, eilen' a corresponding transitive 'ziehen, zerren,' as in OHG. *zogōn* 'eilen: ziehen, zerren.' The transitive 'draw, bring' we have in Gk. *ἐν-δύω*, *ἐν-δύρω* 'bring in, put on, draw on,' as well as the intransitive 'go in, enter,' *δύω* *δύρω* 'put on, draw on; enter,' Lat. *in-duō* 'put on; deck, cover, envelop,' as, *pomis se induit arbos*, Verg. G. 4, 143; *vites se induunt uvis*, Col. 4, 24, 12; *cinis induit urbes*, Val. Fl. 4, 509.

We can compare, therefore, Skt. *duvās* 'hinausstrebend,' MHG. *zouwen* 'eilig ziehen, eilen,' MDu. *touwen* 'agitare, premere, pressare': Gk. *ἐν-δύω*, *ἐν-δύρω* 'bring in, put on; go in, enter,' Lat. *induō* 'put on; deck, cover, envelop': OE. *tūn* 'enclosure, yard, town,' *tynan* 'enclose, fence; shut, close,' etc. Here also Skt. *dvāratī* 'cover, check,' base *due-ro-*.

II.

The IE. root *ǵheu-* occurs in Germ. in the double sense 'gush out, pour' and 'shout, howl.' In all probability the two are identical. The common meaning was 'swell up, burst out' or the like. This would give both 'gush out' and 'shout.' These two meanings are very frequently combined. So Gk. *χέω* and Lat. *fundō* are used of pouring out or uttering words or sounds.

From the primary meaning 'swell, burst out,' may come the following:

1. Skt. *juhōti* 'pour, offer,' Gk. *χέω* 'pour, shed, scatter, strew,' pass. 'gush forth, stream, flow, melt,' *χύδην* 'abundantly; confusedly,' *χυδαῖος* 'abundant,' *κοχυδέω* 'flow, stream forth,' Lat. *fundō*, Goth. *giutan* 'pour,' etc.: OHG. *gusi* 'torrent,' ON. *gusa* 'spurt forth,' *gjōsa* 'burst forth, stream out,' *geysa* 'set in violent motion, excite,' *gusta* 'blow, breathe,'

gustr 'gust, blast,' *gjōsta* 'cold blast': Gk. *χυλός* 'juice, moisture,' MHG. *gāl* 'boar, male animal' (cf. author, *PBB*, xxiv, 527), ON. *gul*, *gol* 'gust of wind,' *gull* 'round swelling, tumor,' *gulpa* 'swell, blow out,' Dan. *gulpe* 'aufstossen, schlucken,' E. *gulp*: ON. *gufa* 'vapor, smoke,' MHG. *guft* 'boasting, exultation.'

From 'swell, burst forth' may come also:

2. Skt. *hávātē*, ChSl. *zova* 'call,' Goth. *gaunōn* 'mourn,' ON. *geyfa* 'howl, bark,' *gaud* 'barking,' *gaul* 'howl, shout,' *gaula* 'howl, shout,' Gk. *χάομαι* 'be in violent emotion, be angry.'

III.

1. Goth. *sweiban* 'aufhören, ablassen': OHG. *swifōn* 'stille sein,' *swiften* 'zum schweigen bringen, beschwichtigen' are supposed to be related to OHG. *swigēn* 'schweigen,' OE. *swigian* 'be silent' (cf. Kluge, *Et. Wb.* s. v. *beschwichtigen*). They may be, but there is no good reason for connecting them with Gk. *σιγᾶω*.

The Germ. words evidently start from the meaning 'depart, cease,' and this, as I shall show, is a development of 'swing, sway, swerve, deviate, bend.' So in the following: MHG. *sweim* 'das schweben, schwingen, schweifen,' *sweimen* 'sich schwingen, schweben, schweifen,' *swimen* 'schwanken, schweben,' OE. *swima* 'dizziness, swoon,' *ā-swānian* 'cease,' *swānian* 'become dark': OHG. *swinan* 'schwinden, hinschwinden, abnehmen,' MHG. *swinen* 'abnehmen, dahinschwinden, bewusstlos werden, in ohnmacht fallen.'—OHG. *swihhōn* 'vagari, schweifen,' *swihhan* 'ermatten, nachlassen,' MHG. *swich* 'fortgang, lauf,' OE. *swican* 'wander, depart, cease,' *ge-swicennes* 'cessation, abstention,' *swicn* 'clearance from criminal charge,' Goth. *swikns* 'rein, unschuldig'; OE. *ge-swican* 'withdraw, desert, deceive,' *swic* 'deception,' etc. Here 'wander, depart' develops into a variety of meanings.—OE. *swōpan* 'sweep, brandish; rush, dash,' ON. *svipa* 'move rapidly, hasten,' *sveipa* 'sway, swing,' *svipt* 'quick movement; loss, harm,' *svipt* 'loss.'—OHG. *swintan* 'schwinden, vergehen,' OE. *swindan* 'waste away; be torpid.' These pre-suppose a root *swi-*, which is also in the following, and with a similar development in meaning.

OHG. *swebēn* 'schweben,' *sweibōn* 'schweben, schweifen,' OE. *swifan* 'move, sweep,'

swift 'swift,' ON. *svifa* 'schweben, treiben, sich hinwenden, gehen': Goth. *sweiban* 'aufhören, ablassen,' OHG. *swifton* 'stille sein.'—Lith. *svaĩkti* 'schwindelig werden,' *svaigintĩ* 'umherschwanken,' ON. *svig* 'bend, curve, circuit,' *sveigja* 'bow, bend': OHG. *swigēn* 'schweigen,' OE. *swigian* 'be silent,' etc. (cf. Persson, *Wz.* 192 f, on the base *swi-*).

OHG. *swifton* and *swigēn* are, therefore, not directly connected, but each is a derivative of the root *swei-*, *swi-*, and passed independently through the development 'sway, wander, depart, cease, be silent.' It is altogether improbable that this change took place during the IE. unity or even during the Germ. unity. Consequently Gk. *σιγᾶω* 'be silent,' if related at all, must have passed through the same change of meaning independently. We may, therefore, make the following parallel comparisons.

OHG. *sweibōn* 'wander': Goth. *sweiban* 'cease': OHG. *swifton* 'be silent'; ON. *sveigja* 'bend': OHG. *swigēn* ('cease'): 'be silent'; OE. *swican* 'wander, depart, cease': Gk. *σιγᾶω* 'be silent.'

2. Gk. *σιγᾶω*, however, may better be referred to the root *tu-* 'waste away, dwindle': Gk. *σινομαι* 'waste, damage, plunder, hurt,' OE. *pwīnan* 'dwindle, fall away,' *pwītan* 'cut, shave off' (cf. author, *AJP.* xxi, 180).

Some such meaning as 'retire,' 'cease,' 'subside,' 'rest,' etc., we may expect to find as the original of 'be silent.' So the following:

3. Goth. *paħan*, OHG. *dagēn* 'be silent,' Lat. *taceō*, etc., may be derived from the root *tā-* 'waste away.' Compare Gk. *τηναι* 'cause to melt, pine, waste away,' Lat. *tābeō* 'waste away, consume, melt,' ChSl. *tajati* 'sich auflösen, vergehen.'

4. Skt. *dōṣa-s* 'fehler, mangel,' OE. *tēorian* 'fail; be tired': Dan. *taus* 'still, silent, quiet,' *tyst*, ON. *tjást* 'silently, quietly,' root *deu-* (v. supra).

5. Skt. *dhānōti*, ON. *dyja* 'shake,' Skt. *dhvāmsati* 'scatter,' *dhvasmā* 'darkening,' OE. *dwētsian* 'become stupid,' ON. *dāsa* 'be calm, be still,' Dan. *dysse* 'beschwichtigen,' *dvask* 'indolent, schläfrig, saumselig,' OE. *dwēscan* 'extinguish,' etc.: OE. *dwelian* 'lead astray; wander,' *dol* 'dull, stupid,' OHG. *-twelan*

'steif werden, betäubt werden,' Dan. *dvale* 'deep sleep,' root *dhū-*.

6. Skt. *kṣēti* 'dwell, abide,' *kṣēma-s* 'wohulich, ruhig,' Gk. *κτίζω* 'found, settle, establish,' *κτίλος* 'gentle, tame,' Lat. *sileo*, 'remain inactive, rest, be still, be quiet, be silent,' Goth. *ana-silan* 'be still, be silent,' OE. *sālnes* 'silence' (cf. Prellwitz, *Et. Wb.* s. v. *κτίζω*; Brugmann, *Grd.* I², 791). Here the idea of silence comes from 'settle down, subside, rest,' which is very closely related to 'depart, retire, cease,' though the primary meanings from which the two ideas came are quite different.

The root *kpei-* of the above may also be in Lat. *sīdō* 'settle, alight, sink down, sit down,' in which case compare Gk. *κτίζω* < *κτιδίζω* (but cf. Brugmann, *Grd.* I², 504 for a different explanation). In any case we may compare the similar development of meaning in Lat. *sīdō* 'settle,' *subsīdō* 'sink, settle, subside, abate,' E. *subside* 'abate, cease to rage, become quiet.'

IV.

1. Late OE. *wīl* 'wile, trick': ON. *vīl* 'bedrängnis, bekümmernis, not, elend': Lat. *vīlis*, 'low, mean, base,' Welsh *gwael* 'vilis,' *gwaelod* 'fundus, faex' (cf. Fick, *Wb.* II⁴, 259): Lith. *vėla* 'wire': Skt. *vēla* 'end, border, shore, time, tide': *vēllati* 'swing, sway wave' (cf. Uhlenbeck, *Ai. Wb.* s. v.).

These are all from the common meaning 'roll, twist, turn, bend.' For OE. *wīl* compare Lith. *kreivas* 'turned, crooked': *krivida* 'cheating, deceit'; OHG. *scranchōn* 'sway, stagger,' *screnchan* 'bend, slant: deceive,' *scranc* 'deceit'; OE. *wrencan* 'twist, turn: play tricks, be deceitful,' *wrenc* 'artifice, trick'; OE. *lūtan* 'turn, bend, bow, fall': *lot* 'deceit,' Goth. *lutōn* 'deceive,' and many others. Lat. *vīlis* meant primarily 'bent, bowed, cast down, abject,' hence 'low, base.' Skt. *vēla* represents the original signification 'turn, turning-point.' So NHG. *zeile*, *ziel*, *zeit* are from the root *dī-* 'turn, whirl' (cf. author, *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc.* xiv, 333). The others need no further explanation.

Though we may compare these various words, it does not follow that, even though related, they are from a common IE. base **ueilo-*, **uilo-*. It is possible that not one goes

back to such an IE. stem. But it is practically certain that all come from a root *wei-*.

A root *wei-* occurs in Skt. *váyati* 'weave, plait,' *vyáyati* 'wind, wrap up,' ChSl. *viti* 'twist, wind, plait,' Lith. *vejù* 'turn, twist,' Lat. *vicō* 'twist, plait.' The meaning 'plait, weave' is from 'turn, twist.' Identical with this root, therefore, is the root *-wei*, in Skt. *vēti* 'turn, direct, guide, wield (weapon), drive, pursue, strive after,' Lith. *vejù* 'chase, pursue,' etc. (For other derivatives see Uhlenbeck, *Ai. Wb.* s. v. *vēti*.) Compare the similar development in the root *uerg-*: Lat. *vergō* 'bend, turn, incline,' Skt. *vāryati*, *vr̥ṇakti* 'turn, twist off; turn aside,' OE. *wrencan* 'twist, turn: play tricks,' Skt. *vyjind-s* 'crooked, false, sly': *vr̥jati* 'wander, go away, go,' OE. *wrecan* 'drive push, expel, avenge,' Goth. *wrikan* 'verfolgen,' etc.

We see, therefore, that OE. *wil* 'wile' is the figurative use of 'turn, twist,' and that Lith. *vēla* 'wire' is a literal 'twist'; that ON. *vīl* 'bedrängnis, not, elend' comes from the derived meaning seen in Skt. *vēti*, Lith. *vejù* 'pursue, chase'; and that Skt. *vēlā* should likewise be referred to *vēti*, from which is also derived Skt. *vayānā* 'grenze, ziel' (cf. Uhlenbeck, *Ai. Wb.*), with which compare Lith. *višūnas* 'eine schlingpflanze.'

The secondary meaning found in ON. *vīl* is seen in several other possible derivatives of the root *wei-*. Here the development in meaning is 'turn, drive, pursue, persecute, afflict' and then 'scold, revile,' pass. 'be afflicted, grieve, mourn,' etc. So the following:

2. Goth. *wainags* 'elend, unglücklich,' OHG. *wēnag* 'elend, gering, klein,' OHG. *weinon* 'weinen, klagen, beklagen,' ON. *veina* 'lament, wail,' OE. *wānian* 'complain, bewail,' *wānung* 'lamentation' (cf. Schade, *Wb.*): Lith. *vainōju* 'schmähe, schelte, schimpfe,' *vainyju* 'verspottete,' *vaina* 'war,' ChSl. *po-vināti* 'subjicere,' Av. *vyānō* 'pursued,' etc., base *wei-no-* 'turn, drive, pursue,' etc. Here also belong Skt. *vēnd-s* 'desirous,' that is, 'turning toward, striving after,' *vēnati* 'desire, be envious,' and Av. *vaenaiti* 'see,' primarily 'turn toward' (cf. Uhlenbeck, *Ai. Wb.*, who rejects this combination). These are more remotely connected with Lith. *vytiōju* 'wickle,' Pol.

wingc 'wickeln, wedeln,' Lat. *vinea*, *vīnum*, etc.

3. OHG. *weida* 'weide, jagd,' OE. *wāp* 'wandering, traveling; hunting,' Skt. *vītā-s* 'verfolgt': Lith. *vaitōju* 'wehklage, jammere.'

4. OE. *wīte* 'punishment, torture, misery,' *wītnian* 'punish, torture,' *wītan* 'reproach, blame,' Goth. *fra-weitan* 'rächen,' etc.: Lith. *vaĩdas* 'zank, streit,' *vaĩdau* 'zwiste, streite': OS. *gi-wītan* 'go,' base *wei-do*, *wei-do* 'turn, twist, zwisten; torture, punish,' etc.

Goth. *-weitan* is usually referred to the root *weid-* 'see.' But though undoubtedly belonging to the same root, it did not develop from 'see,' but 'see' is an outgrowth of the same primary meaning (cf. author, *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc.* xiv, 324).

5. OE. *wægan* 'afflict; frustrate; deceive' < **waigjan* 'twist, torture; turn aside, frustrate; distort, verdrehen': Skt. *vici-s* 'trug, verführung,' Lett. *vīkt* 'sich biegen,' *vīkne* 'ranke,' Lat. *vicia* 'vetch': Skt. *vīci-s* 'wave,' Lith. *veikus* 'quick,' Lat. *vincō* 'subdue, conquer,' Goth. *weihan* 'fight,' etc. (cf. Uhlenbeck, *Ai. Wb.*), base *wei-go-* 'turn, twist; whirl, be active,' etc.

6. OE. *wēlan* 'torment, afflict': ON. *vīl* 'bedrängnis, not, elend,' *vīla* 'complain, lament,' OE. *ā-wēlan* 'roll, roll away; afflict,' *wīl* 'wile,' etc.

7. So also the root *swi-* 'sway' (v. supra) develops in a similar manner: MHG. *swimen* 'schwanken, schweben,' OE. *ā-swēman* 'wander about, depart: suffer, grieve.' With this compare the following.

8. OHG., OE. *swingan* 'swing, beat,' OE. *swancor* 'pliant, supple; agile, graceful; weak,' *swincan* 'labor, be in pain,' *swencan* 'afflict, torment,' Germ. base *swing-*, *swink-* 'swing, move about, exert oneself, toil, suffer.' These have been connected with ChSl. *sukati*, Lith. *sūkti* 'drehen.' Compare also Skt. *svāñc*, *svāñcas* 'sich leicht wendend, gewandt' and *svājate* 'umschlingt, umarmt,' *svajā-s* 'eine art schlange.' Here also the primary meaning is 'turn, wind, twist' (compare NHG. *schlingen*: *umschlingen*: *schlange*), and the double form of the root corresponds exactly to the Germ.: *sueng-*, *sueng-*. Here probably also Lith. *sunkūs* 'heavy,' etc., primarily 'swing, dangle, hang down.' Compare Lith. *svirus* 'schweb-

end, schwankend, baumelnd': *sverih* 'weigh,' OHG. *swār* 'schwer,' etc.

A similar development in meaning is seen in the root *ter-*, *trē-* 'move rapidly, whirl, turn, twist': 'rack, torture, afflict; be afflicted, suffer.'

9. Skt. *tārati* 'go across, get through,' *taralā-s* 'trembling, unsteady,' Lat. *terō* 'rub,' Gk. *τερίω* 'rub, wear away, afflict, distress'; OHG. *drāen*, *drehen*, OE. *prāwan* 'turn round, revolve; twist, rack,' *prōwian*, OHG. *druoen* 'suffer' (cf. author, *PBB*, 24, 532). There can be no reasonable doubt as to the relation of *ter-* 'tremble,' *ter-* 'rub,' and *trē-* 'turn, twist.' Compare Gk. *πίπη* 'swing, rush, whirl,' *πίπτω* 'throw,' OHG. (w)*riban*, MHG. *riben* 'turn, rub, dance,' ODu. *wriwen* 'rub,' ON. *rifa* 'tear' (cf. author, *Pub. M.L.A.* xiv, 331).

10. Gk. *τρέπω* 'turn, put to flight, drive,' *ἐν-τρέπω* 'turn about, shame, reprove,' Lat. *trepō*, *trepidus*, etc., OE. *prafian* 'urge; reprove, correct' (v. *PBB* as above), *præft* 'quarrel,' ON. *præfa* 'quarrel,' Lith. *trepti* 'stamp, trample,' Gk. *τραπέω*.

11. Lat. *torqueō* 'turn, whirl, roll, twist; hurl; rack, torture': Lith. *treñkti* 'dröhnend stossen,' Goth. *preihan* 'drängen,' *preihsl* 'bedrängnis,' ON. *prýngva*, OHG. *dringan* 'dringen, drängen, drücken,' OE. *pringan* 'press, oppress, afflict,' *brōh* 'hatred, envy.'

12. OE. *pracu*, *ge-præc* 'pressure, force, violence,' *prec* 'grievous,' ON. *þjarka* 'zank, hader.' With the latter has been compared Skt. *tārjati* 'droht, schmäht.' Compare also Lat. *tergeō* 'rub,' base *ter-go-* 'rub, press, press upon,' ON. *þrek* 'exertion, strength,' *þrekaðr* 'worn out, tired,' OE. *ge-pracen* 'adorned, prepared.' Compare Lat. *terō* 'rub, thresh, tread upon; polish, furbish,' Gk. *τέρην* 'smooth, soft.'

13. Gk. *τερῆδων* 'wood-worm; caries,' Lat. *terēdō*, Lith. *trendēti* 'be worm eaten,' base *terē-d-*: Skt. *tyñātti*, *tardayati* 'bore into, split, open,' ON. *præta* 'zwist, zank,' *præta* 'zanken,' Lat. *tardus* 'delaying, slow,' *tardō* 'tarry, delay; hinder,' primarily 'wear away, spend, prolong,' as in Gk. *τερίω*.

14. OE. *præstan* 'twist; press; torture, afflict,' *prist* 'bold, brave; shameless' = 'vordringend, vordringlich, obtrusive,' Lat. *tristis* 'afflicted, bedrängt, sad' (cf. Noreen, *UL*. 232).

The base *trī-* of the above is seen in Lat. *trī-vi*, *trī-tus*, *de-trī-mentum*, *trī-bulum*, Gk. *τριβω* 'rub, bruise, thresh, wear away; spend, prolong, delay,' *τριβή* 'rubbing, wearing, spending; delay, putting off,' (cf. Persson, *Wz.* 16), ON. *prīfa* 'grasp, hold fast, seize,' *prīfla* 'grope about, umhertappen,' *preifa* 'grope.'

For the secondary meaning in Lat. *tardo* and Gk. *τριβω* compare Skt. *pratārdyati* 'zieht hin, verlängert,' Lith. *terėti* 'halten, festhalten,' Lat. (*tempus*) *terere*.

15. Skt. *tarn-s* 'quick,' *tarutē*; Gk. *τέπος* 'worn out, jaded,' *τρώω* 'rub, rub off, harass, afflict, distress, vex,' *τρώος* 'distress,' OE. *prēan* 'oppress, afflict; punish, chasten; try to compel, threaten; rebuke,' *prēa*, *prawu* 'affliction, oppression, severity, rebuke, threat,' OHG. *drouwen* 'drohen'; Lat. *trūdō* 'thrust, push, crowd, drive, press,' OE. *prēatian* 'urge on, press; afflict; rebuke, threaten,' *prēat* 'crowd, troop; violence, ill-treatment; threat,' *prēatnian* 'force,' *prēotan* 'wear out, weary,' OHG. *bi-driozan* 'bedrücken, verdriessen,' etc., ChSl. *truditi* 'beschweren, quälen,' Lith. *triūdnas* 'afflicted, sad'; OE. *ge-pryl* 'crowding, crowd,' *prēal* 'correction, rebuke; punishment; threat,' *prēapian* 'rebuke'; Gk. *τρώω* 'rub away, wear out,' ON. *prūga* 'press,' OHG. *druccen* 'drücken,' OE. *pryccan* 'press, trample; press forward,' *prycnes* 'affliction,' *proht* 'grievous; hardship, affliction' (Germ. -*kk* in *drücken* is from pre-Germ. -*ghn-*); ON. *prýsta* 'press, squeeze, thrust,' OE. *prysman* 'oppress,' *ge-pryscan* 'afflict, depress,' Lith. *triūszkinti* 'crush,' Gk. *τερούω* 'wear away,' Skt. *tāruṣati* 'overcome.'

The development in meaning seen in the above is very common and is found in all periods down to the present time. Wherever we find a word expressing 'violent motion' we may expect to find that it or some word akin to it denotes 'violent emotion,' and where we find 'twist,' we may expect 'torture or 'writhe.' Hence a host of such terms as *agony*, *distress*, *anguish*, *affliction*, etc.

16. Skt. *jāyati* 'ersiegt, besiegt,' *jināti* 'überwältigt, unterdrückt,' Gk. *βιάζω* 'overpower, do violence to, wrong,' etc.: Goth. *gainōn*, ON. *kveina*, OE. *cwānian* 'lament,' pre-Germ. **gʷoi-nā-* 'oppression, affliction,'

OE. *cwīpan* 'lament,' ON. *kviða* 'be afraid, fear,' base **g^ui-to-* 'afflicted; crushed, subdued,' ON. *kveita* 'overpower,' base **g^uoi-do-* 'force, violence.'

To the same root probably belong Skt. *jināti* 'grow old,' OE. *cwinan* 'waste away,' etc. These are from a base **g^ui-n^a-* 'overcome, crushed, shrinking.'

17. ChSl. *žima* 'press together,' Gk. *yéuω* 'be loaded, be full,' Lat. *gemō* 'groan; bewail' (cf. Prellwitz, *Et. Wb.*): ON. *kumbl* 'grabhügel,' MHG. *kumber* 'kummer,' pre-Germ. **g^umlō*, *g^umrō*. 'pile, load,' and later 'weight, grief.' Wherever 'heaviness' occurs as a developed meaning is naturally found 'sadness, grief.'

18. Gk. *στενός* 'narrow, compressed,' *στένω* 'difficulty, trouble, distress': *στένω* 'groan, sigh,' ON. *stynja*, OE. *stenan* 'groan,' *stunian* 'resound,' Du. *stenen* 'stöhnen,' Skt. *stánati* 'resound, roar,' etc. These are generally referred to an IE. root *sten-* 'resound,' which is supposed to be related to *ten-* 'resound.' In any case 'resound' is a developed meaning. The root *sten-* probably meant primarily 'press together,' whence 'be afflicted, groan,' and finally resound as in Lat. *gemō*. But 'groan' and not 'resound' is the prevailing signification. The explanation here given is an old one, and should be revived.

19. Gk. *ἄγχω* 'press tight, throttle; vex,' Lat. *angō* 'press together, throttle; torment, torture,' *angustia* 'narrow place, narrowness; distress,' OHG. *angust* 'angst, besorgnis' (cf. Kluge, *Et. Wb.*).

V

E. *swathe*, *swaddle*, OE. *swāpian*, *swāpelian*; *swāpel*, *swēpel*, OHG. *swedil*, 'bandage' are related to Lith. *saucziū*, *sausti* 'umhüllen, umgeben,' *saustimas* 'das umgeben,' base *suo-to-*, *sou-to-* 'wrap, envelop.' This probably came from a root *seu-*, *sou-* 'roll, wind up, wrap.' Compare the root *suo-to-* in OHG. *sweifan* in 'drehende bewegung setzen, winden,' *sweif* 'umschwung, umschlingendes band,' ON. *sveipr* 'band,' OE. *swāpels* 'cloak, garment' (v. supra).

As 'whirl, twist, wind' is the original of *swathe*, etc., we may further connect Lith. *siautėti* 'rasen, toben, wüten' and OHG.

siodan 'sieden,' etc. (cf. Berneker, *IF*, x, 160), base *seu-* 'swing, sway, roll,' etc.

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

Cornell College.

A FEW BÉOWULF NOTES.

1. *Geslōh þin fæder fæhðemæste*, 459.

This line is commonly understood to mean: "thy father fought the greatest fight," or "fought out the greatest feud (or, of feuds)." However, this use of *geslōan* with an object like *fæhð(o)* is not supported by any other instance. It has also been insisted by Trautmann (*Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik*, Heft ii, pp. 153f.; cf. *Anglia*, *Beiblatt*, x, 258) that, apart from the inadmissibility of the vulgate interpretation, the metrical structure of the line is faulty; and that *Béowulf* scholar even despairs of finding a plausible emendation, which in most cases is only too readily hit upon. But is there really any obscurity of meaning? What should prevent us from taking *geslōh* in the well established 'perfective' sense of 'got by fighting'? We have here, in fact, substantially the same function of *geslōan*, as in *mærða geslōgon*, *Béow.* 2996; *tir geslōgan*, *Aeðelst.* 3f.; . . . *gestlōg . . . cynerica mæst*, *Wids.* 38f; *hūde . . . gestlōh*, *Gen.* 2149. The parallel use of *gefeohtan*, *gewinnan* as well as of *geferan*, *gegūn*, *geærnan*, *gesiltan*, etc., is so well known as to need nothing more than a passing allusion. That *fæhð* is something not exactly desirable, does not alter the case. Cf. *Gen.* (B) 301; 660.

Our (literal) translation is accordingly: "thy father brought about (or, brought on his head) by fight the greatest feud"—or, better: "the greatest of feuds," for *fæhðe* is no doubt meant for the genitive plural, just as in 'Crist' 617: (*geþingade þeodbændum / wið fæder swæðsne*) *fæhpa mæste*. The following lines tell the origin and circumstances of the feud, which is finally compounded by *Hrōðgār: siððan þā fæhðe fæo þingode*, l. 470. (The definite article in this line is clearly significant; cf. *Lichtenheld, Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum* xvi, 340.) It is obvious that *Hrōðgār* does not mean to relate a great exploit of *Ecgpēow*'s—otherwise his intention would have been carried out very unsuccessfully!—, but in this

whole passage he merely emphasizes the friendly relations existing between the Danes and Gēatas. The same thought is uppermost in the king's mind, when the arrival of Bēowulf is first announced to him (ll. 372 ff.).

The question, whether our line is metrically right or wrong, appears to be still *sub iudice*. Kaluza does not question it any more than l. 262a: *wæs mīn fæder* (see his remark in *Die Metrik des Beowulfliedes*, p. 76; cf. *þone þīn fæder*, l. 2048a; Sievers, *Beitr.* x, 289). At any rate, we are fully justified in not tampering with a passage which in its sense is satisfactory.

Thorpe's and Toller's version: "thy father quelled (in fight) the greatest feud" is, of course, out of the question, since it violates both semasiology and context.

2. *wēan āhsodon* (-e), 423; 1206.

The signification of 'nancisci, experi'; 'endure, experience'; 'erfahren, erdulden' foisted upon the verb *āhsian*, in order to explain these two places (Grein, Heyne, Socin, Harrison-Sharp, Holder, Garnett, Hall, Wyatt, W. Morris, Toller, Sweet, Trautmann) is merely a guess which frequent repetition has not been able to invest with any show of probability. It seems to us that there can be no mistaking the import of the latter instance:

*hyne wyrd fornam,
syþðan hē for wlenco wēan āhsode,
fēhðe tō Frýsum.*

The verb *āscian* 'demand, call for, seek for, inquire' suggests at once *sēcan*, both in meaning and construction. We may compare, for example: *sceolde sweordes ecg! feorh ācsigan*, Andr. 1132 ff., and: *on healfa gehwone hēawan þōhton, / sawle sēcan*, Bēow. 800f.; *sēcean sawle hord*, ib. 2422.¹

The following two passages:

*þā ðū færinga feorr gehogodest
sæcce sēcean ofer sealt wæter,
hilde tō Hiorote*, ll. 1988 ff.

and:

*þæt ys sīo fēhðo ond se feondscipe,
wæl-nið wera, ðæs ðe ic wēn hafo,
þe ūs sēceað tō Swēona lēoda*, ll. 2999 ff.

¹ *Past. Care* 171, 24 ff. *Þæt* is, *ðonne* *ðonne* *ðara* *lareowa* *hieremenn* *hwæthwugu* *gæsðlices* *to him* *secað* *ond hi* *frinað*, *ðonne* *is* *suiðe* *micel* *scand* *gif he* *ðonne* *færð* *secende* *hwæt he* *sellan* *scyle*, *ðonne* *he* *iowan* *scolde* *ðæt* *him* *mon to* *ascað*.—Cf. *Heliand* 829f. that *ic* *thi* *so* *serag-* *mod . . . escon* *scolda* . . . = *querrebamus* *te*.

furnish the closest possible parallels to our lines in question.² "He had gone to the Frisians for trouble." Whether this phrase had a subaudition of grim humor for the Anglo-Saxon mind, it is hard to determine.

As regards the construction of *sēcan*, it is familiarly known from a classical Alfredian passage: *hū man utanbordes wīsdōm ond lare hieder on lond sōhte*. See Koch II², § 425; Sievers, *Beitr.* xii, 194. A remarkable mistranslation is offered by Socin, who omits the comma after *āhsode*: "(Hygelāc) hatte Unglück im Krieg gegen die Friesen." *wēan* is, of course, parallel with *fēhðe*, just as in Finnsb. 27f. *wēa* appears coupled with *hild*: *fæla ic wēana gebād, / heordra hilda*.

It stands to reason that the same interpretation should be claimed for *wēan āhsodon*, in l. 423, whatever construction we place upon the context of that disputed passage.

We find *āhsodon* (-e) given well enough as 'sought' in Thorpe's edition. Still better is Rieger's "auf etwas ausgehn." Earle's rendering of the second passage: "when he for wantonness challenged woe, feud with the Frisians" is better than that of the first: "they had been acquainted with grief."—See also the *N. E. Dict.*, s.v. 'ask.'—It is a pity that Körner's brief, but excellent comment, in *Englische Studien* I, 488, has not made a stronger impression on editors and translators of the poem.

3. *Ðær wæs on blōde brim weallende,
atol yða geswing eal gemenged*, 847 f.

Earle: "There was the face of the lake surging with blood." All the other translations within reach are practically the same, thus failing to bring out the close syntactical relation of *wæs* with *on blōde*, amounting to the connection of substantive verb + predicative adjectival phrase. In other words, *brim weallende* stands in the same relation to *wæs on blōde*, as *atol yða geswing* does to *eal gemenged*.³ "There was bloody the surging water, the awful billowy flood all (Earle:) turbid."

(a) *gemenged* is used in an absolute sense, as in l. 1593: *þæt wæs yð-geblond eal gemenged*,

² Note also Beow. 338 f.: *wen ic þæt ge for wlenco . . . Hroðrar sohton*.

³ If we mistake not, this was Professor Zupitza's interpretation. His discussion of *deað-fage deog* in *Archiv* 84 is not accessible to us.

'confusus,' 'turbatus' (see Grein). (*ge*)*mengan* is more or less synonymous with (*ge*)*drēfan*, also (*on*)*hrēran*. Cf. Boet. Met. v. 7 ff.: *swā oft smylte sē saderne wind, / grāge glashlūtre, grimme gedrēfēð, / þonne hīe gemengað micla ysta, / onhrērað hronmere*. Further Bēow. 1416 f.: *wāter under stōd / drēorig ond gedrēfed; Andr. 369f.: þā gedrēfed wearð, / onhrēred hwælmere; ib. 393f.: grund is onhrēred, / deope gedrēfed; etc.* We believe that this is also the proper meaning of *mengan* in Bēow. 1449: (*se hwīta helm . . .*) *sē þe mere-grundas mengan scolde, / sēcan sund-gebland*, though it has been rendered, with great unanimity (Grein, Heyne, Socin, Harrison-Sharp, Holder, Sweet [*Ags. R.*], Wyatt, Garnett, Hall, Earle), as 'mingle with, visit'; 'sich worunter mengen, wozu gesellen.' Only in Thorpe and Toller do we find the translation 'mingle together, stir up, disturb.' The analogous application of (*ge*)*drēfan* and (*on*)*hrēran* goes, indeed, a long way to prove this to be correct. Instead of citing many examples, which can easily be found with the help of Grein, we call attention only to one passage in 'The Husband's Message,' ll. 19 ff.: *heht nū sylfa þē / lustum tēran, þæt þū lagu drēfde ongin mere sēcan, mēwes ēpel!*, which should be compared with ll. 40 ff. in the same poem: . . . and on *yþa geong āna* (Grein) *sceolde / faran on flotweg, forðsipes georn, / mengan merestreamas*.

(b) For the formula-like nature of *brim weallende*, which forbids a syntactical separation of the two words, compare the following passages:

Andr. 1574: *oð þæt brēost oferstāg brim weallende*.

Bēow. 545 f.: *oþ þæt unc flōd fōdrāf, / wado weallende*.

Andr. 1542 f.: *hrēoh wæs þær inne / beātende brim*.

Panther 7 f.: *brim grymetende, / sealt-yþa geswing*.

Exod. 477: *brim berstende blōdegesean hwēop*.

(c) As to the semi-adjectival force of *on blōde*,⁴ we would refer to a group of well-known expressions in which the substantive verb (or *weorðan*) + prepositional phrase may

⁴ Also modern English: aglow, afire, alive, asleep, etc., may be compared.

be regarded as a periphrasis for a simple verb. For example, *þā wæs on sālum since brylla*, Bēow. 607, = El. 194, etc.; *þā wæs mōdigra mægen on luste*, El. 138; *flōd wæs on luste*, Andr. 1573, etc.; *weorod wæs on wyne*, Bēow. 2014, etc.; *wesað on mōde*, Finnsb. 13; *sōna wæs on sunde* (=swimming), Bēow. 1618; *werod wæs on tyhte*, El. 53, etc.; *Lida bið longe on sīpe*, Gnom. Ex. 104, etc.; *hē on fylle wearð*, Bēow. 1544; *wearð on fleame*, Andr. 183; *bēo ðū on ofeste*, Bēow. 386, etc.

Examples of this kind abound in the Heliand, for which see Sievers' collection of formulas.

It would thus seem that Cosijn's condemnation of l. 847 as 'onzin' was hardly justified. However ingenious his readjustment of the passage may be, there is some advantage in getting along with the reading of the MS. Bēow. 847 makes as good sense as Exod. 572: *ealle him brimu blōdige pāhton*.

[After finishing this note, we discover that Trautmann (*Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik*, Heft ii, pp. 162; 171 f.) has vindicated *on blōde* = 'bloody,' as "good Old English," with reference to *on searwum*, *on life*, *on sēlum*, *on wāpnūm* (?).]

4. *æpelinga bearn ealra twelfa*, 3171.

twelfa looks like the genitive plural and is explained as such by Grein (in the *Sprachschatz*, s. v. 'twelf'), Heyne, Socin, Harrison-Sharp, Holder, Wyatt, and by Thorpe, who translates: "of all the twelve." Now it is not absolutely impossible that the use of a genitive form has been occasioned by attraction to *ealra*. Still it is most likely that *twelfa*, in place of *twelfe*, is merely due to scribal carelessness or indifference, and that *twelfa* really stands for the nominative plural. *ealra* is the partitive genitive pure and simple, denoting "the whole of which a part is taken." *ealra twelfe* = 'twelve of the entire body.' This construction belongs in the same class with *æghwæs unrim*, *æghwæs genōh*, *manigra sum*, *feara sum*, *alra (fācna) gehwylc*, *hwæt ealles*, etc. (for example, Bēow. 2624, Wund. d. Schöpf. 94, Bēow. 2091, Bēow. 3061, El. 645, Ps. 119, 3.—Prose examples in Wülfing's *Syntax*, *passim*). Its explanation is to be sought in the great predilection of the Anglo-Saxons for partitive relation with which every

student of Old English literature is conversant.

A number of precisely analogous instances (*ealra fife, fene*, etc.) are collected by Grein, in his *Sprachschatz* i, p. 239, where he also—perhaps unwittingly—corrects *twelfa* of our passage to *twelfe*.

A phrase of similar import, but arising from a different conception is *seofone ætsomne*, Andr. 996, etc. Cf. Sievers, *Anglia* xiii, 3.

5. A comparison of the different editions readily brings to light a good deal of uncertainty, and sometimes inconsistency, in the editors' treatment of MS. spellings.

For example, *fealo*, l. 2757, is kept by Holder (1895) and Wyatt², changed to *fela* by Thorpe and Grein, to *feola* by Wülker and Socins.

The infinitive forms of the MS.: *hlodon*, l. 2775, *ongyton*, l. 308, appear in the printed texts as follows. Thorpe, Grein: *hladan*, *ongytan*; Holder, Wyatt, Socin: *hlodon*, *ongyton*; Wülker: *hladan*, but *ongyton*.

Again, the singular genitives *wintrys*, l. 516, *Heaðoscilfingas*, l. 63, *yrfeweardas*, l. 2453 Wyatt, with his usual fidelity: = MS.; Thorpe: *wintres*, *Heaðoscylfinges*, *yrfeweardes*; Grein: *wintres*, *Heaðoscilfingas* (in his separate edition: *Heaðoscilfingas*), *yrfeweardas*; Holder: *wintrys*, *Heaðoscilfingas*, *yrfeweardes*; Wülker: *wintrys*, *Heaðoscilfinges*, *yrfeweardes*; Socin: *wintres*, *Heaðoscilfingas*, *yrfeweardas*.

The imperatives *wæs*, l. 407, and *spræc*, l. 1171, are retained by Socin, normalized to *wes* and *sprec* by Grein, Wülker, Holder; Thorpe prints *wes*, but *spræc*; Wyatt: *wæs*, but *sprec*.

abrēot, l. 2930, the preterite of *abrēotan*, is changed by Grein only to *abrēat* (in Grein's separate edition: *abrēot*). Yet Holder, Wyatt, Socin print *deað* (*deap*), in l. 1278, where the MS. reading *peod* would rather favor the form *deop*.

unigmetes, l. 1792, is uniformly replaced by *ungemetes*. But see Sievers, *Angelsächs. Gram.*, § 212, n. 1.

To mention a final illustrative case in point, in l. 70, all the editors read without change *ylde bearn*, four of them, at least, believing in the interpretation "children of the age." There can be no doubt, we think, that "child-

³ We quote from all the editions within reach, except the old Heyne and Harrison-Sharp.

dren of men" is the only allowable rendering—the proof of analogy is quite conclusive—and that *ylde* is an allowable variant for *ylde*. The ending *-e* in the genitive plural of masculine and neuter nouns, while not very frequent, is by no means unheard of. A few examples occur in the Durham Ritual: *cynno*, *gimæro* (Lindelöf, p. 106); some more in the Lindisfarne Gospels: *wæro*, *mynetno*, *gefehto*, *wærcco*, *monno*, etc. (see E. M. Lea, *Anglia* xvi, *passim*); further, in the Epistola Alexandri: *sīð fato*, *teohifato*, *earfeðo*, *Mēdo*, also *ondswaro*, Sievers, *Beitr.* ix, 230; in the Bede (cf. Miller i, p. li): *Breotono*, *Norðanhymbro*, *gebeodo*, *ælo*, *geurilo*, *linterigo*; also 'Wulfstan' 225, 32: *linterigo*. Cf. also Sievers, *Angelsächs. Gram.*, § 237, n. 4. If then, the editors of these texts do not level the ending to *-a*, it appears to us perfectly proper to retain the *-o* in *Béowulf*, though the derivation from *ylde* has to be abandoned.

It is easily seen that a fair amount of normalizing is still practised in various editions. No doubt the editor is at liberty to substitute 'regular' forms, if he chooses. But then let it be distinctly understood that it is his policy to do so; and let him state what standard he is following. On the whole, it seems safer to us to err on the side of conservatism, especially as we have to do with a text the antecedents of which are not sufficiently known.

We may try, of course, as has been done, to explain certain variations of spelling from a contamination of different originals. But those are hopelessly beyond our reach. The sole tangible basis for editorial work is the existing MS.

6. . . . ac se wonna hrefn
fæs ofer fægum fela reordian,
earne secgan, hu him æt æle spōw,
penden hē wið wulf wæl rēafode, 3024 ff.

Of this suprisingly bold and brilliant picture we were reminded—the difference of the situation notwithstanding—when we read in the poetical Edda;

- . . . hvað þeir á bapmi
bápir sǫgðu
hrafu ey ok qrn,
er þeir heim rípu.

(Brot af Sigurðarkviðu, 13.)

Of the numerous occasions on which raven and eagle are introduced in Old English poetry, this is the only one where they hold a conversation. That we find them 'singing' in other places is of little consequence; for the same holds true not only of their companion on the battlefield, the wolf (Exod. 164; El. 27, 112), but likewise of dead objects, like horns, trumpets, swords, coats of mail (cf. for example, Béow. 1423; 1432; 1521; Exod. 159; El. 109; Byrhtn. 284).—In Norse song and saga, on the other hand—as we see from the Eddas—the gift of speech is a common attribute both of ravens and eagles. This may or may not be of significance.

FREDERICK KLAEBER.

University of Minnesota.

FRENCH GRAMMAR.

The Essentials of French Grammar by C. H. GRANDGENT. D. C. Heath & Co., Boston: 1900. 12mo, vii, 101 pp.

MR. GRANDGENT'S "Essentials of French Grammar" is practically an enlarged edition of his "Short French Grammar." The wording of many paragraphs is the same as in the older work, the main difference being a fuller explanation of forms and rules, the addition of exercises and the omission of phonetic spelling throughout the grammar. In view of the many additions in Mr. Grandgent's second grammar, it seems unfortunate that he should have selected the title "Essentials." It would appear more proper to call his earlier work the "Essentials of French Grammar." The two titles, as they now stand, will inevitably cause confusion in the minds of teachers who have not examined these grammars.

The excellence of the "Short Grammar" is also a feature of the "Essentials." The same general presentation of the subject-matter is followed, the verb being first considered, whereas the article and the noun are discussed at the very end of the grammar. A brief *résumé* of the leading forms of the article, noun, and adjective precedes the main treatment of the verb, so as to enable the student to translate intelligently the short sentences

given in the numerous exercises accompanying the statement of verbs.

It would be useless to discuss the propriety of making such a complete treatment of the French verb precede the simple rules of article, adjective and pronoun agreement. The claim that the verb forms the principal element in a sentence is taken as a reason for this arrangement. But this argument actually proves too much, for if the grammarians believing in it were true to it, they would have to treat first the more common verbs and the more usual rules governing the use of tenses and moods, then the article, noun, adjective, pronoun, and only towards the end of the grammar, the more complex rules of verb syntax with the varying idiomatic uses of verbs. In other words, the treatment of the parts of speech would have to be divided, and this division would bring the author back to a treatment very similar to that of former grammars. It must further be acknowledged that the older arrangement is more logical in that grammatical forms, which have not been explained, do not have to be used in the illustrations.

The preceding reasoning does not imply that the order followed by Mr. Grandgent in the treatment of his subject is undesirable. It should be taken more as a defence of other grammars than as a criticism of Mr. Grandgent's arrangement, an arrangement which he, of course, does not claim to be original with him. It merely proves that the old order is not necessarily illogical nor harmful, and the inevitable conclusion is that the sequence in treatment is not so important as the clear presentation of the subject-matter itself. In this respect, Mr. Grandgent cannot be too highly praised. Infelicities of statement occur occasionally, some teachers may think that they could improve on the wording of an occasional rule, but no grammar is ever absolutely perfect. Teachers who have used this work are free with their praise, and, assuredly, they are the only competent judges.

As a mere reference book this grammar cannot rank as high as some others. Suggestion plays an important rôle. For example, if a certain rule in the treatment of the verb should suggest a rule of pronoun or adjective agreement, this agreement is explained in the

chapters on verbs. This method may prove successful in teaching grammatical rules, but it is fatal in a work for reference. This is not a fault in the grammar; it may even be considered a merit; but attention should be called to the fact that the "Essentials" is not a reference grammar, and had better not be used as such. A complete index might, to a certain degree, meet this difficulty, but, in this connection, it must be said that Mr. Grandgent's index is practically useless for reference. Under each heading is given a list of paragraphs dealing with some particular grammatical form, and the investigator must look through all these paragraphs to find the matter he wants, to discover perhaps, after his search, that the point he wishes to investigate is not treated at all. This is a decided disadvantage, and should be remedied.

A few special remarks, bearing principally on what has been stated above, may not be inappropriate; p. vi—Might it not be possible to give also a scheme of lessons more in accord with the older treatment of parts of speech? p. 2: 5—Why should not the *u* of *tu* be elided according to this rule? *tu* does not differ in accentuation from *je*. Nor does *qui* differ from *que*; p. 3 (last line but one)—Is "please" a good translation of *donc*? p. 4, l. 1—Read *naïvement*; p. 6, Note 4—Read "less . . . than;" p. 13: 3—*geai* is pronounced "jè," not "jé." p. 14: 6—The pronunciation of the first *e* in *examen* as "é" is frequent, but does not seem to be justified by the best authority; p. 67—It might be well to make some statement about the agreement of the past participles of reflexive verbs, and of past participles used without auxiliary or followed by an infinitive; p. 68 (A)—Rules for the non-agreement of *fait* might be given; p. 68 c—This rule is a case of "suggestion;" p. 78, l. 2—Insert "second and" before "third." p. 94, Supplementary Exercises 1—The introduction of *tu* is confusing; p. 149 a—It is a pity to introduce the form *porté-je* before the explanation of its formation (given on p. 152); p. 152 a—Mention the common formation of a question by the addition of *n'est-ce pas?* to the positive statement; p. 154 a, b—Two other cases of "suggestion;" p. 160: 2, 3—It would seem better to use the expressions "pronominal phrases" and "adjective phrases" (see p. 161 b); p. 168

a—Mention the form *si fait*; p. 182—It would be well to distinguish here between *il y a* and *voilà*. This suggestion leads to the question as to whether the English or the French expression should be made the starting-point of a rule. Should the statement be "*il y a* means . . ." or "'there' is rendered by . . . ?" This is not an inappropriate query in the discussion of Mr. Grandgent's grammar, since he uses both forms of statement, and it is important, because on its answer depends often the classifying of a rule. In this particular case, to take the English phrase "there are" as a starting-point would place *il y a* and *voilà* in the chapters on adverbs. There seems to be a slight inconsistency in the author's manner of meeting this difficulty. Perhaps this inconsistency is inevitable. See, for example, p. 289: 1 (second half) where the rule is not clear because the starting-point is the English phrase. On p. 347 b English is again the starting-point; p. 211 b—*est-ce que je peux?* should be mentioned; pp. 230, 231—Why omit *défailler*, *échoir*, *ouïr* and *seoir*? p. 253—Does *envoyer* come under the heading "verbs of motion?" The idea in *venir*, *aller*, etc., is subjective, whereas in *envoyer*, etc., it is objective; p. 275 l (end)—Another case of "suggestion;" p. 285 a—The force of this rule cannot be fully grasped by the student, for he is not yet supposed to know what the interrogative pronouns are; p. 301: 270—The old but not unfrequent use of *qui* as interrogative subject referring to an object might be mentioned; p. 312 a—An explanation of the construction *c'est (un brave homme) que* would not be inappropriate; p. 314: 282 b—Why is this statement brought in here? p. 320: 2 (end)—The statement "in certain cases" is too indefinite, especially since a fairly accurate and comprehensive ruling can be given; p. 331: 4—The use of *jamais* followed by a noun and meaning "never a" might be explained; p. 337—The heading "peculiarities in Singular" may be confusing unless a corresponding heading be inserted on p. 340; p. 343: 307—Is *trois heures et demie* an appropriate illustration? p. 345 e—It might be well to state that in other cases *tout* is invariable; p. 347 b—Mention the use of *entier*; p. 352: 314—Explain the use of *que de* before an infinitive; p. 359 a—Explain the agreement of *nu* and

feu; p. 371: 329—The appositive use of *de* in such phrases as *un diable d'homme* might be explained and illustrated; p. 372 b—The rendering "at (or to) the home of" of *chez* is not sufficient, and will inevitably lead, at times, to incorrect translations.

The following points should be treated; the use of *à* to denote a characteristic. The use of *à* after *être*, as in *il est à plaindre* (possibly in § 78 b).¹ The formation of adverbs by the addition of *-ment*. The use of *ou . . . ou* and of *soit . . . soit* (or *ou*). The use of *que* to avoid the repetition of such adverbs as *quoique*, *lorsque*, *quand*, etc. An explanation of these and other common points would be expected in a grammar intended to cover two or more years of study.

The foregoing remarks have been made only after a cursory glance through the grammar, not after a use of this work in the class-room, and these criticisms are not offered with any intention of fault-finding; they may not even appeal to the best judgment of teachers, but they indicate, to a certain degree, the weak points of Mr. Grandgent's grammar. They are, however, of very minor importance when contrasted with the general excellence of his work. "The Essentials of French Grammar" will be welcomed by all teachers as a useful help in the study of French, and will appeal with especial force to instructors who prefer the author's order in the treatment of his subject to the method employed in the majority of French grammars published in America.

EDWIN S. LEWIS.

Princeton University.

MODERN GERMAN LITERATURE.

Die deutsche Litteratur des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. Von DR. RICHARD M. MEYER. (*Das Neunzehnte Jahrhundert in Deutschlands Entwicklung*, Bd. III.) 2te Auflage. Berlin: G. Bondi, 1900. Pp. xxii, 960.

It is a reproach brought against German literature that criticism has always followed too closely on the heels of creative work, that it

¹ Here is an illustration of deficiency in the Index. The paragraph dealing with the passive rendering of an active infinitive is not given under the heading "infinitive;" The proper reference is placed under "*faire*" and "*lasser*;" fortunately it is the first given under these headings.

has even occasionally attempted to steal a march upon poetry. The analytical and critical tendency in the German mind has no doubt robbed German poetry in the last two centuries of a certain *naïveté* which belongs to it by nature; for the German national temperament, compared, for instance, with that of the Latin peoples, is essentially *naïve*. On the other hand, it may fairly be urged that German literature might never have attained classic dignity at all, had it not been for the active interference of criticism. However this may be, the gulf between the wholly uncritical poetry of the German Middle Ages and the theory-ridden literature of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is so great that it is sometimes difficult to conceive of both as coming from the same race; in no literature is it so hard to recognize a process of continuous evolution from the earliest beginnings to the present day as in that of Germany; indeed, were it not for the existence of an unbroken *Volksliteratur* which forms the basis for such an evolution, it would be impossible. In even the least balanced *Flegeljahre* of New High German literature there is, if the expression be permissible, a certain *Zielbewusstsein*; the critic and the theorist seem to be standing constantly in the background, explaining how certain results have been arrived at and marking the lines on which the literature of the future must develop. To appreciate the present volume, this prerogative, which German criticism, back to the times of Opitz and Gottsched, has so persistently assumed, must be borne in mind; Professor Meyer does not merely write history; he also takes an active share in the literary evolution of the moment.

Whether this quality of *Zielbewusstsein* is to be regarded as an evil or not, it at least materially lightens the task of the literary historian, and especially the historian of recent and contemporary literature. German literature in the nineteenth century has not been one whit less confused or confusing than that of any other European people, but the mere fact that the Germans have had clearer ideas than other nations as to what their literature was doing, and whither it was tending, has made the task of writing the history of that literature easier. The path which the modern historian of German literature must tread is pretty well marked

out for him; and there are certain broad movements which mark clearly where one chapter ought to end and another begin. In one respect, however, Professor Meyer has refused to profit by these natural advantages; he has preferred to divide his book artificially into ten chapters, each chapter being devoted to a decade. But he has himself obviously felt the limitations of this method, for he often groups together writers who show marked affinities in spite of the fact that their work belongs to different decades. We find, for instance, Gottfried Keller, Theodor Fontane and Fritz Reuter discussed in Chapter v (1840-50), although all belong, as a matter of strict chronology, to the second half of the century; and such examples might be multiplied. The division into decades can, after all, only be regarded as a preliminary to something better. Professor Meyer has not, it is satisfactory to see, allowed himself to be too much hampered by it, and it has at least the redeeming feature of keeping before the reader the synchronism of literary events. The student who approaches modern German literature on more organic principles is too apt to overlook the inevitable overlapping of literary movements. A more serious charge that must be brought against the work is that it is not, as its title would imply, so much a History of German Literature in the Nineteenth Century, as a History of Contemporary German Literature, with an introduction on the literature of the early Nineteenth Century; the first two decades of the century receive eighty-nine pages, the last two one hundred and eighty-seven. For this, Professor Meyer's excuse is

"dass wir für die Epoche bis zu Goethes Tod Darstellungen haben, die mit vollem Recht längst in den nationalen Besitz übergegangen sind, während für die neuere Zeit viel weniger brauchbare Vorarbeiten vorlagen, als für andere Gebiete."

But such a reason can hardly be accepted as valid. The phrase "bis zu Goethes Tod," which occurs on the title of so many histories of German literature, is in almost every case an excuse for not doing the literature of the first third of the century justice, for regarding it merely by the reflected light of Goethe's glory; I can think of no work—certainly not Julian Schmidt's—in which an honest attempt

is made to see in it the beginning of a new era. The contemporary critics of German literature from 1800 to 1830 had, it may seem paradoxical to say it, clearer ideas of the value and significance of that literature than the critics of the next generation who, one and all, allowed themselves to be blinded by the re-discovery of Goethe's greatness. Even so great a critic as Dr. Georg Brandes, lecturing in Copenhagen in 1874, could only see the goal of the German literary movement of the beginning of the century in the Revolution of 1848. This was, however, a great point gained, for the academic standpoint had hitherto been to consider that literature as something purely *Epi-gonenhaftes*. But it seems to me that we must go still further before justice is done to the literature of these decades; we must bring into prominence the elements in it which differentiate it from the literature of the eighteenth century; we must see in it the first important stage in that conflict between Hegelian collectivism, on the one hand, and individualism on the other, which gives the European literature of the entire nineteenth century its distinctive coloring. Only from such a standpoint can we, it seems to me, realize the enormous significance of German Romanticism for the development of European literature. I do not know whether Professor Meyer is in sympathy with such a point of view, but he is too acute and stimulating a critic, too warmly in sympathy with modern ideas, not to help us materially in revising our ideas on this subject. For this reason it is to be regretted that he did not begin his history in earnest with the year 1798, the birth-year of the Romantic School, instead of waiting until Goethe was dead.

Although the first twenty or thirty years of the literature of the century are thus treated in a somewhat *stiefmütterlich* fashion, the perspective and proportions of the rest of the volume are good. The authors whom Dr. Meyer brings into the foreground are no longer the mediocre novelists and poets who, in the belief that they were keeping alive the classical traditions, only succeeded in being *hausbacken*, authors whom it used to be fashionable to read—in England at least—as typical specimens of German literature in the nineteenth cen-

ture. The literary movement which drew its inspiration from Munich in the sixties and seventies, must, I fear, be held responsible for the contemptuous shrug with which the educated Englishman still tells you that Germany has only produced one writer of eminence since Goethe. The views which Dr. Meyer expresses, and the criticism which he gives us, have a distinctly cosmopolitan flavor; it is the kind of criticism which can be offered to a French or English reader with some hope of its being convincing; the point of view is, in essentials, at least, rarely merely German. This is to me the importance of this work as compared with older books covering a similar field.

To turn to a few details. The pages on Grillparzer are finely conceived and full of fresh ideas; it is pleasing to find Professor Meyer writing so warmly of Grillparzer's *Libussa*, which has long enough been passed over cursorily as a mere "book-drama." One looks, by the way, in vain for another *Libussa* in the book, a play that should have had some notice in a history of the nineteenth century, Brentano's masterpiece, *Die Gründung Prags*. That Gottfried Keller is "der grösste Schöpfergeist" in German literature since Goethe is, apart from the danger of superlatives, surely not a very happy characterization; the kind of greatness which Keller possessed was not, I think, pre-eminently creative greatness. No one can wish to underrate Keller's magnificent epic genius, but, after all, he had his limitations. It may seem heresy to say it, but there are pages in Keller—and not only in *Martin Salander*—where the punctilious German *Beamter*, with his love for the exact and the petty, is more in evidence than the creative poet. Hebbel and Ludwig are well characterized and contrasted; Meyer emphasizes excellently the peculiar rôle which Hebbel played as an innovator in the development of the German drama, a rôle which has brought him, within the last few years, into extraordinary prominence. The warm enthusiasm for Germany's greatest poetess, Annette Droste-Hülshoff—an enthusiasm which Professor Meyer had already expressed in an excellent essay in his volume of *Deutsche Charaktere*,¹

¹ Berlin: E. Hofman, 1897.

—is as welcome as the condemnation of the *Mirza Schaffy* order of lyric which predominated in the fifties and sixties. In his criticism of Heine, on the other hand, there is a singular lack of freshness. The most serious flaw in the matter of proportion seems to me the space given to Theodor Fontane. I am afraid Dr. Meyer has here allowed the fascination of one of the most charming personalities in modern literature to interfere with his purely critical judgment; it becomes a matter of personal taste and not of literary history, when Professor Meyer devotes to Fontane twenty-eight pages, and to Spielhagen, a much more important factor in the evolution of the modern novel, only five. That time has lain heavily on Spielhagen's work is unfortunately true, but it ought not to be forgotten that there was a generation of critics, before the brothers Hart, who had quite as high an opinion of *Problematische Naturen* as we to-day have of *Effi Briest*. I doubt very much if the next generation will read Fontane with as much patience as the present generation still reads its Spielhagen. No one will grudge the space given to Anzengruber, Sudermann, and Hauptmann; although here, too, a word might be said on the subject of due proportion. The pages on Hauptmann contain, moreover, some of the best and most illuminating criticism in the book. Wildenbruch is, on the whole, justly estimated, but it offends one's sense of fair play to find that judgment based on *Wilhelm*, one of Wildenbruch's weakest pieces. In the later chapters, I fail occasionally to follow Dr. Meyer in his somewhat strongly expressed likes and dislikes. Why, to take one example, is Helene Böhlau praised so warmly and Gabriele Reuter so heartily condemned? In the verse of one of the newest of the new poets, Stefan George, to find "einen Abglanz homerischer Kunst" savours too much of impressionist journalism. A writer like Ferdinand von Saar, who, with the exception of Heyse, at his best, seems to me the greatest living master of the short story, might have had more space allotted to him; and indeed, the contemporary Austrian writers are all unduly overshadowed by their North German colleagues. I am inclined to think that there is at the present moment more promise for

the future of German poetry in Vienna than in Berlin.

Professor Meyer's History of Modern German Literature is thus essentially a personal book, a book from an individual standpoint; one might even describe it as the expression in criticism of the literary creed of the last twenty years in Germany. The newest Young Germany has become what it is because it has appreciated the greatness in Grillparzer and Hebbel, in Heine and Droste-Hülshoff, in Keller and Conrad Ferdinand Meyer. Dr. Meyer's book is thus in itself as much a *mémoire pour servir* as the literature of the last twenty years which it discusses; but it is an indifferent tribute to a work of criticism to say that it is only a document for the use of the future historian; and this work is certainly more. One can conceive of a history of German literature in the nineteenth century being written from a different standpoint, of a book in which light and shade are distributed differently, and here and there more justly, but I doubt if it will ever be possible to re-enthroned the gods who are here deposed, or in the main essentials to arrange otherwise the hierarchy of German literature since Goethe's death. Meyer deserves the credit of having given us the first History of German Literature in the Nineteenth Century which, notwithstanding its excessive detail, is written from a cosmopolitan point of view.

JOHN G. ROBERTSON.

University of Strassburg, Germany.

FRENCH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE.

Anleitung zum Studium der Französischen Philologie für Studierende, Lehrer und Lehrerinnen, von DR. EDUARD KOSCHWITZ, Professor an der Universität Marburg. Zweite, vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage. Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1900. 8vo, vii and 183 pp.

It is a pleasure to find that Prof. Koschwitz's eminently practical *Anleitung zum Studium der Französischen Philologie*, Marburg, 1897, has already reached its second edition. It is just such a guide as every American, as well

as every German, student needs both for his work at home and for a trip abroad for purposes of study.

This second edition has been increased in size by the addition of some forty-five pages of reading-matter and an index. The work has not been rewritten, but additional paragraphs have been inserted on: Französische Schriften über Deutschland; Reisen in die Provinz; Ferienkurse zu Nancy und Grenoble; and Annahme von Lehrerstellen. At the same time numerous paragraphs already appearing in the first edition have been remodeled, either in whole or in part, and the many bibliographical references have been brought up to date as regards new works which have appeared in the last few years, while at the end there have been appended several opinions of the first edition which were published in some of the leading scholarly journals.

Of interest to American scholars will be the newly added references to Dr. Hugo P. Thieme's bibliography of French literature during the nineteenth century.¹ In glancing over the Index one is surprised not to find the name of M. Paul Meyer, although that of his *confrère*, M. Gaston Paris, appears conspicuously. A few unimportant paragraphs are found to have been omitted, but extensive additions are to be noted in the lists of students' boarding-houses given for Paris, and also for certain Swiss towns much frequented by German students.

The change in type noticeable in the second edition appears to have been for the better in the matter of clearness, but it is a subject for regret that the headings given in the Table of Contents were not repeated in the body of the work. The only misprints noted were 1855 for 1885 on page 112, and *Glédal* for *Clédal* on page 113.

This little manual is designed to serve as a guide, both for those who wish to fit themselves for the practical work of the classroom in teaching Modern French, and for those who desire to take up the serious study of the French language and literature in preparation for positions in the faculties of the German universities. In it Prof. Koschwitz has once more given proof of his grasp upon the prac-

¹ See pp. 140 and 144.

tical as well as the theoretical side of his profession as a modern language teacher.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

Johns Hopkins University.

THE SACHSENSPIEGEL.

Die Reimvorreden des Sachsenspiegels. VON GUSTAV ROETHE. Abhandlungen der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse. Neue Folge, Band II, No. 8. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1899. 4to, pp. 110.

THE modest title of Roethe's treatise hardly suggests its rich contents. The discussion of the rhymed preface to the *Sachsenspiegel* forms only the introductory part of an investigation into questions of far-reaching importance. It concerns a field in which comparatively little has been accomplished so far: the Middle Low German period. However simple the explanation for this apparent neglect may be—in the main it rests upon certain utilitarian considerations, the interrelation between university work and the secondary school programme—from a purely scientific point of view this disregard for a literature however inferior but none the less pertinent for questions of literary influences and linguistic development is very much to be regretted. What little there has been done is due, in the main, to the activity of the *Verein für Niederdeutsche Sprachforschung*, and it is a hopeful sign that another academic teacher has turned his attention to this subject.

What Homeyer, the jurist, had been unable to decide upon, Roethe establishes beyond a doubt: the two parts of the rhymed preface (vv. 1-96, and 97-230) are the work of two authors, differing in personality and in their technique. The rhymed couplets (Part II) only can be attributed to Eike von Repgow. These couplets thus offer the starting point for a most thorough investigation into the language of the author.

Eike was a Low German; his *Sachsenspiegel* recorded the laws as evolved among his countrymen. It would have been but natural

to employ the dialect of his native land if the vernacular had at that time developed a literary language; but this condition was lacking. To become the founder of a new literary language Eike did not possess the requisite creative genius; his mind was that of the reasoning jurist, content with committing the statutes to writing, but stopping short of the other difficult problem, that of the literary use of a purely Low German language.

Eike's work with its peculiarly mixed speech offers the same problem that has been a *crux* to the interpreters of the *Hildebrandslied*, of Veldeke and Wizlav—to mention only these typical cases. The *Sachsenspiegel* might have been written down in Low German and lost its original habitus during the long process of copying and reworking into a southern idiom; it might have been first committed to writing in High German and found acceptance among Low Germans only in a Saxon garb. Neither of these suppositions leads to satisfactory results. There is a third possibility: the author divested his language of local peculiarities and approached it to the neighboring High (Middle) German dialect, avoiding what might have been unintelligible to his countrymen. And this procedure was no innovation on the part of Eike; it was an evolution starting with the earliest Low German authors and leaving its imprint on the literary productions up to about 1300. They all show the same characteristics—a tempered language that is neither Low nor High German. When with the beginning of the fourteenth century the Saxon dialect is gradually raised to a poetical language, it shows till its final decline, with the introduction of the reformation, the traces of its former bondage.

A full enumeration of the arguments brought forward by Roethe cannot be attempted here. I must content myself with this brief *exposé* of the keynote of his contention. That the whole array of proofs and assumptions will stand the test of further research nobody will claim; the personal equation is discernible here and there.

The scantiness of the available reliable text material—the *Sachsenspiegel* edition itself leaves much to be wished for—and our meagre sources of the cultural conditions of that

period in the North perhaps put some arguments in the wrong place, or at least leave some theories open to further discussion. Thus, for instance, Roethe's belief that the imitation of High German, and the consequent absence of specifically Low German forms, was an unconscious process, that it more or less forced itself on the Low German writers, is not fully substantiated. Similarly, it seems that the later period—the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries—was ushered in by a more conscious effort on the part of northern poets. If the people had at that time reached a higher educational level, and took sufficient interest in official transactions to necessitate the substitution of the mother tongue for the learned Latin, the mere inertia that gradually introduces the vernacular into literary use hardly explains the change of conditions, even if coupled with the fact that literary productiveness in the South was on the wane. Be that as it may—so far only theory against theory!—these objections do not touch the main issue. Roethe has certainly succeeded in formulating the problem and pointing the way that is to lead the editor of Middle Low German texts, and the historian of mediæval North German literature, out of baffling perplexities. I do not hesitate to call Roethe's work the most important contribution to Germanics within the last years. Attention might, in this connection, be called also to Carl Kraus, *Heinrich von Veldeke und die mittelhochdeutsche Dichtersprache*, Halle, 1899, and Wrede, *Die Heimat der altsächsischen Bibeldichtung*, *Z.f.d.A.* xliii, p. 333, and *ibid.* *Anzeiger*, p. 387.

H. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG.

University of Chicago.

SCOTTISH LITERATURE.

The Wallace and the Bruce Restudied. J. T. T. BROWN. Bonn: 1900 (*Bonner Beiträge*).

ALL students of the two Scottish national epics have been perplexed by certain difficulties connected with the authorship and integrity of the texts, which editors have never satisfactorily cleared up. The present work is an attempt to explain these anomalies by the help of a somewhat startling theory.

First, as to the facts.

The *Wallace* has been preserved to us in a unique MS. bearing the colophon: "Explicit vita . . . Willielmi Wallace militis per me Johannem Ramsay anno domini 1488." As Ramsay was the scribe of the MS. of the *Bruce* which is included in the same volume and subscribed "raptim scriptus per me Johannem Ramsay," and also presumed to be that of the Cambridge *Bruce*, subscribed "per manum J. de R., capellani"; and as these three MSS. are said to be in the same handwriting, it has always been supposed that Ramsay was simply a copyist. The authorship of the *Bruce* was known; that of the *Wallace* was assigned by ancient tradition (apparently never questioned till now) to Blind Harry, or Henry the Minstrel, though no mention of the author's name occurs in the book itself.

That there was such a person as Blind Harry living in the reign of James IV, there is no doubt. There are entries of small gifts to him from the royal treasury, and he is mentioned among dead poets by Dunbar (*circa* 1508). John Maior says that he was blind from his birth, that in the time of his (Maior's) infancy he fashioned¹ (*cudit*) a book of the deeds of Wallace, *carmine vulgari*, and that he earned his food and clothing by reciting stories—*historiarum recitatione*—before noblemen. From these facts it is clear that Harry was one of the wandering minstrels, at once poet and beggar; and this has been the invariable tradition. The "stories" which Maior says he recited are supposed to have been portions of the *Wallace*.

Straight as this story seems, there are difficulties in the way. It is hard to think that a wandering beggar who could not write, could compose and hold in memory a continuous epic of nearly 12,000 lines. It is still harder to understand how a man blind from his birth should have such clear impressions of natural objects, and such minute knowledge of Lowland topography, both east and west. Even stranger than this is his familiarity with books, such as Chaucer and the romance writers. He even implies a knowledge of Latin by asserting that he drew much of his material

¹ Mr. Brown's translation. *Cudit*, however, means "printed," from which it would seem that Maior thought the edition of Myllar and Chepman, 1508, to have been the original form.

from an (unknown) Latin chronicle by Master John Blair. That a wandering beggar, born blind, and living in Scotland in the fifteenth century should attain a familiar knowledge of poetry, romance, and Latin books, would be little less than a miracle; and if he really accomplished it, it is hardly conceivable that he should nowhere in his book refer to himself or his blindness in either justifiable pride or apology.

With regard to the *Bruce*, the case is different.

John Barbour, Archdeacon of Aberdeen in the second half of the fourteenth century, is a very substantial person mentioned in a multitude of records, which also fix the year of his death as 1395. The rubric to the *Bruce* declares it to be his composition, and this is confirmed by Wyntoun, a younger contemporary, who cites long passages from it. The work is preserved in two MSS., one, as previously stated, written by John Ramsay, and one by "J. de R. Capellanus."

But difficulties arise here also. Is it likely that the language of Barbour, an Aberdeen man, would not be distinguishable from the dialect of Lothian a hundred years later? Could Barbour, who lived in the next generation, and who, as he tells us, had obtained information from men who had borne a part in the events he narrates, have made such a strange error as confounding King Robert with his grandfather, Bruce the Competitor—not to speak of other slips and confusions? Then again, there are the long extracts preserved by Wyntoun, which differ considerably (and usually for the better) from the *Bruce* MSS. All these things seem to point to a recasting of the original text by a later hand.^a

Mr. Brown's contention is that the *Wallace*, as we have it, is not the composition of Blind Harry, but the work of John Ramsay, hitherto regarded as only the copyist; and that the same Ramsay revised, embellished, and to some extent re-worded, the original text of the *Bruce*. One point on which he justly lays stress is the eulogy of the Ramsay family,

^a Mr. Brown's argument, drawn from the similarity of parts of the *Bruce* to passages in Froissart, (which Barbour could not have seen) does not strike me as very forcible. Froissart travelled in Scotland in 1363 collecting material for his *Chronicles*, and he may well have conversed with the very persons from whom Barbour had his information.

rather violently brought into the texts of both the *Bruce* and *Wallace*. But his attempt to prove that Ramsay was at least a versifier on the strength of a fragment of a little moral poem found embedded among some (printed) statutes of James III, and (as Mr. Brown supposes) inserted there by Ramsay, it amounts to just nothing; and I think he could have made a stronger point of the fact that whereas both MSS. of the *Bruce* are said to be written by John Ramsay, or J. de R., the *Wallace* is subscribed: "the life of William Wallace, by me, John Ramsay."

If this Ramsay was such a considerable poet, why is he not mentioned by somebody, and why does not his contemporary, Dunbar, include him among his "makaris?" One answer to the latter query might be that Dunbar mentions only dead poets, and Ramsay may have been alive; but Mr. Brown thinks that he does mention him under the title of "Sir John the Ross." He supposes that Ramsay may have held the office of Ross Herald, and was called "Sir John the Ross," as an honorary title, or to distinguish him from the other John Ramsays, who were pretty numerous. The household books of James IV, Mr. Brown tells us, prove that there was a Sir John the Ross at Court, but he brings no evidence to show that his name was Ramsay. This if admitted, would perhaps explain the "J. de R." affixed to the Cambridge *Bruce* (1487), but it would fail to explain why in the *Wallace* (1488), and the Edinburgh *Bruce* (1489), he calls himself simply John Ramsay. Another difficulty lies in the fact that J. de R. of C text calls himself "chaplain," and John Ramsay of the E text says that he wrote "at command of the vicar," showing that if the two were one person, he was an ecclesiastic, and as such could not have held the military office of herald.

Throwing aside this quite unsubstantial speculation, I must admit that a somewhat plausible case has been made out for Ramsay. But there are still serious difficulties in the way.

In the first place, if Ramsay was ambitious of literary honors, and had written an important poem which was certain to be widely read, why does he nowhere in that poem mention

himself as the author? Unless indeed the colophon, "written by me," was intended as an announcement of authorship.

If Ramsay was the author of so considerable a poem, which went into print about 1508, and was reprinted twice in the sixteenth century, why does nobody speak of him as a poet, and why, at least from the time of Bellenden in the next generation, has the *Wallace* always been attributed to Blind Harry?

If Ramsay composed the *Wallace*, and enlarged, re-wrote, and modernized the *Bruce* to suit his taste, as he was (by the hypothesis) also the scribe of the Cambridge *Bruce*, the vocabularies and spelling should be identical. A slight and hasty examination shows that this is not the case. For instance:

B uses *ane* before both vowels and consonants; W before vowels only. The scribe of B has a predilection for the initial *g*, sixty-one words in the glossary beginning with that letter, to only eight in W.

Manteme (maintain), *bot and* (and also), *cowyne* (fraud), *owth* (above, beyond), *outta* (overtake), *angyr* (misery), *yunkerly* (constantly), *abaid* (tarrying), *apparaill* (apparatus), *out of daw* (slain), *schiltrum* (phalanx), *thusgat* (in this manner), common in B, are not found in W.

W has *fewtir* (socket for a spear) and *pissane* (neck armour, camail) not in B. *Lowdyane* (Lothian) in B is *Lowthiane* in W.

Chenzies, *oist* (*oyst*, *oost*), *maiss* (*mayss*), *pusounne*, *forouten* (*for-owtyne*) in B, are *chenys*, *ost*, *makis*, *poysoun*, *with-owtyne* in W.

The impressions produced on my mind by previous reading of the *Bruce* and *Wallace* have been:

FIRST. That the *Wallace* is not the production of a wandering beggar, blind from birth, but of a man of reading and considerable literary skill, in possession of his eyesight.

SECOND. That the *Bruce* has been extensively tampered with by somebody between Wyntoun's time and the writing of the Cambridge MS.

These impressions are confirmed by Mr. Brown's researches.

On the other hand, I cannot see that he has adduced any *proof* that Ramsay was the author of the *Wallace* and the re-caster of the *Bruce*, though both suppositions are possible.

I quite agree with Mr. Brown that "J de R. capellanus" of the Cambridge *Bruce* (and another poem) is not, as Prof. Skeat supposes, another way of writing "Johannes Ramsay;" but I entirely dissent from his conjecture that Ramsay used the former signature to signify "John, Ross Herald." I strongly suspect that the assumption (by Prof. Skeat and others) that the handwriting of the two MSS. is identical, has been too hasty, and that the J. de R. of the Cambridge MS. is a different person from the Johannes Ramsay of the Edinburgh *Bruce* and *Wallace*.³ That Dunbar's "Sir John the Ross" may refer to the Ross Herald (whoever he was) seems to me a plausible conjecture. I also fully agree with his views about the supposititious *Brut*.

Mr. Brown deserves the thanks of students of the early Scottish literature for his careful examination of this highly interesting subject, which I trust will receive further investigation at the hands of some competent scholar.

WM. HAND BROWNE.

Johns Hopkins University.

PROSODY.

Studies from the Yale Psychological Laboratory. Edited by EDWARD W. SCRIPTURE, Ph. D., Director of the Psychological Laboratory. Vol. VII. New Haven: 1899. 8vo, 108 pp.

THE larger part of this issue is occupied with Dr. Scripture's article, "Researches in Experimental Phonetics" (First Series, 101 pp.); the remainder with his paper entitled "Observations on Rhythmic Action." Of these the first is the only one we shall notice particularly.

According to Dr. Scripture, these studies were begun in October, 1897. The scope of such researches in general would include not only speech sounds as material for language, but also their changes resulting from different mental conditions, such as fatigue, emotion, and the like; it would also include the study of rhythm in speech, with its application in poetry and music. The present study is an attempt to use laboratory methods for the

³ Prof. Skeat himself admits that the text of the two MSS. varies so much that they seem to have been copied from different sources. Certainly this looks as if they were by different scribes.

purpose of settling the controversy in regard to the quantitative character of English verse. The general field seems to the author so rich and so unexplored that there is unlimited gain for any one wishing to enter it, and he announces that to those wishing to use the same methods every possible facility will be afforded by the Yale laboratory.

The scope of the article may be estimated from the headings of its subdivisions:

- I. Apparatus for studying speech sounds.
 1. Making gramophone plates.
 2. Transcribing gramophone records.
- II. The diphthong *ai* found in the words *I, eye, die, fly, thy*.

This study was based upon a recital of the nursery rhyme of *Cock Robin*. The vowels in each of the above words are successively considered under the heads of (1) beginning, (2) pitch, (3) formation, (4) amplitude, (5) ending, (6) relation between curve and color; these are followed by general observations on *ai*.

- III. Study of the words "*Who'll be the parson?*"

- IV. The nature of vowels.

Under the latter head are successively treated (1) Willis's theory, (2) Helmholtz's theory, (3) comparison of the two theories, (4) the noise theory, (5) observations on the nature of spoken sounds, (6) mechanical action in producing vowels.

- V. The mouth-tone in vowels.

- VI. The cord-tone in vowels.

Subdivisions under this head are: (1) the pitch-function, (2) the amplitude function, (3) sequence of word-tones.

- VII. Verse-analysis of the first stanza of *Cock Robin*.

Under the last head the author's summary is as follows:

"These researches were begun in order to settle the controversy in regard to the quantitative character of English verse. A nursery rhyme was selected as being verse in the judgment of all classes of people for many ages. When compared with some of what many of us now consider to be the best verse, it shows various defects, but these defects are typical of the usual deviations from our present standards, and are, moreover, not defects according to other standards. It is also a fact that our notions of verse are largely derived from the rhymes heard in childhood. . . .

The elements in speech whose rhythmical arrangement is the essential of verse as contrasted with prose are: 1, quality; 2, duration or length; 3, pitch; and 4, intensity. The element of quality consists in the nature of the sound as a complex of tones and noises producing a definite effect as a speech-sound. Length, pitch, and intensity are properties of the speech-sound that can be varied without destroying its specific nature; that is, without changing the quality. These four elements can be varied independently.

It seems to be sufficiently well settled that, in addition to variations of quality, that is, of the speech-sounds, the essential change in Greek verse was one of pitch. I have observed a similar characteristic in Japanese verse. Probably no better way of getting an idea of the nature of Greek verse could be found than that of listening to typical Japanese verse. I have also found another form of pitch-verse in a kind of poetical dictionary used by the Turks for learning Persian.

Latin verse was essentially a time-verse, the chief distinction among the syllables being that of length in addition to the change in speech-sounds.

English verse is usually considered to be an intensity-verse, or a verse of loud and soft syllables. The four tables show quite evidently that English verse is also a pitch-verse and a time-verse.

It may be said that in all probability changes of length and intensity went along with the changes of pitch in Greek verse but that they were of minor importance. Perhaps, also, changes of pitch and intensity likewise accompanied the long and short syllables in Latin verse. But I do not think that for English verse we can fully accept the analogous statement that, although the changes in pitch and length may be present, they are quite subordinate to the changes in intensity. It would, I believe, be more nearly correct to say that English verse is composed of strong or weak, or emphatic and unemphatic syllables, and that strength can be produced by length, pitch, or intensity.

The usual scansion of this stanza in strong and weak syllables would give

— — — — —
 — — — — —
 — — — — —
 — — — — —

The three elements: length, pitch, and intensity, are all used to produce strength. Thus the forcible vowel *u* in Line 1 is long and moderately high and loud.

The strength of a syllable may be kept the same by increasing one of the factors as another one decreases. The vowel *o* in *Robin* in Line 1 is strong on account of its length and intensity, although its pitch is low. A syllable

necessarily short may be made as strong as a longer one by making it louder or higher; or a syllable necessarily of small intensity may be strengthened by lengthening it or raising its pitch. Thus, the short *i* of *With* in Line 3 is strong on account of its high pitch and large amplitude; and the weak *æ* of *arrow* in Line 3 is strong on account of its high pitch and its length. This might be called the *principle of substitution*.

An increase in the loudness, length, or pitch of a syllable renders it stronger—other things being equal. Using the symbol *f* to indicate dependence, we may put $m=f(x, y, z)$, where *m* is the measure of strength and *x*, *y*, and *z* are the measures of intensity, length, and pitch respectively. This might be called the fundamental *principle of strength*.

The study of this and other specimens of verse has made it quite clear that the usual concept of the nature of a poetical foot is erroneous in at least one respect. Lines in verse are generally distinct units, separated by pauses and having definite limits. A single line, however, is not made up of smaller units that can be marked off from each other. It would be quite erroneous to divide the first stanza of *Cock Robin* into feet as follow:

Who killed Cock Robin?
I, said the sparrow,
With my bow and arrow
I killed Cock Robin.

No such divisions occur in the actually spoken sounds, and no dividing points can be assigned in the tracing.

The correct concept of the English poetical line seems to be that of a certain quantity of speech-sound distributed so as to produce an effect equivalent to that of a certain number of points of emphasis at definite intervals. The proper scansion of the above stanza would be:

Who killed Cock Robin?
I, said the sparrow,
With my bow and arrow
I killed Cock Robin.

The location of a point of emphasis is determined by the strength of the neighboring sounds. It is like the centroid of a system of forces, or the center of gravity of a body, in being the point at which we can consider all the forces to be concentrated and yet have the same effect. The point of emphasis may lie even in some weak sound or in a mute consonant, if the distribution of the neighboring sounds produces an effect equivalent to a strong sound occurring at that point. Thus the first point of emphasis in the third line lies somewhere in the group of sounds *mybow*, probably between *y* and *o*.

With this view of the nature of English

verse all the stanzas of *Cock Robin* can be readily and naturally scanned as composed of two-beat or two-point lines.

It is not denied that much English verse shows the influence of quantitative classical models, but such an influence is evidently not present in *Cock Robin*.

It is evident that a wide perspective is opened up by these initial studies, and that students of English verse will do well to heed their significance. The results will of course vary with the mode of recitation, so that the personal equation can by no means be eliminated at the outset; and the same will probably be true in some measure of the interpretation of the tracings.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

Molière's Les Précieuses Ridicules, by WALTER DALLUM TOY. Heath's Modern Language Series. Boston (Boards).

Molière's Les Précieuses Ridicules, by C. FONTAINE, B.L., L.D. Wm. R. Jenkins. New York (paper).

Les Précieuses Ridicules is especially serviceable for class use. To begin with, it is short (forty pages) and the narrative is lively while the comedy has a threefold historic interest in that (1) it is the great classic forerunner of French farce comedy; (2) it marks Molière's successful début in Paris; (3) it is a record (albeit in ridicule, and for this it is not the less valuable) of a curious phase of French literature not easily brought to the notice of the undergraduate in any other form.

Mr. Toy has apparently understood the unusual significance of the piece and accordingly divides his excellent introduction (ten pp.) into I, Molière; II, La Société Précieuse; III, Date and reception of the comedy; IV, Bibliographical note; V, Molière's preface.

Under these four sections the editor gives the historical setting of the play in brief and entertaining form.

His notes (ten pp.) are mainly historic, although they contain some suggestive linguistic points. They include the celebrated Carte de Tendre, in itself an amusing and instructive

commentary on precious methods and affections.

Mr. Fontaine's edition, if we rightly understand him, is intended to reach a younger class of students. This we conclude from the large amount of translation contained in the notes (fifteen pp.), and consists frequently of an English so simple that the distorted exaggeration of the *Précieuse* phrasing seems often lost to the detriment of the humor of the piece. Otherwise his notes are well adapted to be of literary value to instructor and class. Mr. Fontaine has, however, chosen to disregard the historical setting of the piece which I deem so important. He includes Voltaire's "Notice sur les *Précieuses Ridicules*" and Molière's own dubious preface without comment however.

He has but two pages of introductory matter that is his own—and that rather informal—containing the following statement which is surely misleading to undergraduates, to say the least: "Mascarille is the *faithful image* (the italics are mine) of the young courtiers that filled the court of Louis XIV."

The statement seems to me unrelieved by anything in the context, yet I hardly think Mr. Fontaine would seriously maintain that the rowdy Mascarille (dressed for a buffoon part, originally even to the wearing of a mask—by the author himself—and still an extravagant drôle in the modified latter-day performances of the Comédie Française) could be the *faithful image* of any sane man save through grossest caricature.

Assuming this second edition to be adapted for younger students, we can readily understand the omission of Mascarille's famous line "Je vais vous montrer une furieuse pluie," with the indicated gesture which is indeed hopelessly vulgar for any age. Yet Mr. Fontaine must have sacrificed unwillingly so valuable an historical side-light.

Both editions would be decidedly more serviceable for the addition of a vocabulary. This convenience has been, I believe, frequently advocated in these pages but seldom with more justice than now. The "*Précieuses*" abounds in words distorted from their natural to special *Précieuse* meanings, some words and phrases having been coined expressly for

the Société, and used exclusively by them. These meanings are subtle and difficult for any but a specialist to reach. Mr. Fontaine has aimed at this in his notes in a greater degree than Mr. Toy.

Both books are well printed and are attractive in form and size.

JOHN DAVIS BATCHELDER.

University of Iowa.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE INTERNATIONAL CORRESPONDENCE FOR STUDENTS AND TEACHERS.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—The "International Correspondence" has now, in the four years of its existence, made great progress in England, France and Germany, and, to some extent, in the United States. Mr. W. T. Stead, Editor of the *Review of Reviews*, in London, has offered one hundred prizes, consisting of books in the languages foreign to the recipients, to be awarded to those students who have made the greatest proficiency in this part of their modern language study. Thirty of these go to each of the European countries most engaged in the correspondence; England, France and Germany, and ten come to the United States. If each teacher, in school or college where the International Correspondence has been introduced, will send to our committee the name of the student considered "the most deserving as regards continuance in regular, careful correspondence, and general character" as soon as possible, we shall be glad to give such student an opportunity to compete for one of the ten American prizes.

The teacher should, in each case, state the reasons on which he bases his conclusion, and send also *two* specimens of letters written by the student in the foreign language, without direct assistance of his instructor.

The competition will close February 1st, 1901, but may be extended two weeks.

Also, will all teachers who have introduced the International Correspondence into their classes, whether they desire to compete for the prizes or not, send their address, with the full name of their institutions, to the chairman of this committee, and state how long the International Correspondence has been introduced, and the number of students now engaged in it. An early report upon this subject is earnestly requested.

EDWARD H. MAGILL,

Chairman of the International Correspondence
Committee of the Mod. Lang. Asso'n of
America.

Swarthmore College, Pa.

OLD FRENCH LITERATURE.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

DEAR SIR:—*The Round Table before Wace*, is a monograph including pages 182-205 of the *Harvard Studies*. The author aims to show that Wace is speaking the truth in the *Roman de Brut* (vv. 9998-9) where the poet refers his account of King Arthur's Round Table to Celtic tradition. In view of the silence of Welsh literature and Geoffrey of Monmouth's omission of any reference, Wace's statement has been rejected by a number of scholars as unreliable.

To vindicate the Norman poet—the first writer to mention the Round Table—and also to support the view of a Celtic origin, the author turns to the *Brut* of Layamon. He argues, from the peculiarly barbarian color of Layamon's Round Table story, unusual with the poet, who rather takes pains to tone down coarse detail elsewhere, that it must represent a native Welsh tale familiar to Layamon by reason of his close contact with Wales.

writers. From such accounts as the *Story of*

¹ Reprinted from Vol. VII of *Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*. Published under the direction of the Modern Language Departments of Harvard University. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1900.

As evidence, further, that Layamon did not invent the episode of the Round Table, which he added to Wace, and the incidental quarrels over precedence at feasts, a number of examples are cited from ancient Irish saga *Mac Datho's Pig* and *The Feast of Bricriu* marked resemblance is shown with Layamon's tale sufficient to admit this latter into the circle of primitive Welsh story.

The author recognizes the objection that, although the Round Table is a Pan-Celtic institution, as he maintains from the Irish sources just given and from the Greek historian Posidonius as well, its connection with Arthur may have been late and first made in Armorica. His reply is the difficulty of supposing a Round Table without an Arthur to give the tradition fixity. Some hero must have presided and the Celts had but one. The treatise is concise, not to say brief, containing very full notes and references and, as an exposition of proof is well ordered.

F. L. CRITCHLOW.

Johns Hopkins University.

BRIEF MENTION.

THE educational reform movement in Germany has scored some important points in the past year. Last May a meeting at Berlin, of philologists and others connected with or interested in higher instruction, adopted and submitted to the government the following resolutions: first, that all graduates of *Mittelschulen* with nine years' courses (*Gymnasien*, *Realgymnasien*, and *Ober-Realschulen*) should be on a footing of equality with regard to the pursuit of higher scientific and professional studies, notably those of medicine and law, for which at present a *Gymnasium* preparation or its equivalent (with prescribed Greek) is required; and second, that the *Mittelschulen* in question should be reorganized so as to offer, in the first three years, a uniform course of study without Latin, thus

enabling the student to postpone the choice between the different courses, that is, the different institutions, until the end of the third year. Something like this arrangement has long been felt by many to be the only possible solution of the problem of higher education; and the curriculum of the so-called *Reformgymnasien*, in which the study of Greek is not begun until the sixth year, instead of in the fourth, marks an important step in that direction. The *Konferenz zur Schulreform*, to which the above-mentioned resolutions were communicated, endorsed the first of the two, but was not ready to agree to the second. Now, however, Emperor William has followed up his previous utterances on the subject with an edict (dated November 20th, and published in the *Reichs-Anzeiger*), in which he indicates the lines along which the reform is to be carried out in Prussia. The most noteworthy points in it are the following: The *Gymnasium*, the *Realgymnasium*, and the *Ober-Realschule* are to be regarded as "in der Erziehung zur allgemeinen Geistesbildung gleichwertig"; the rights of the two institutions last mentioned are, therefore, to be extended; the equality of the three kinds of schools being granted, there is to be, on the other hand, no objection to the emphasizing of the peculiar character of each, as for instance by the extension of the time allotted to Latin in the *Gymnasium* and the *Realgymnasium*; the instruction in Greek is to avoid all "unnütze Formalien," and to aim solely at the appreciation of the literature and of the relation between ancient and modern culture; in the fourth, fifth and sixth years of the *Gymnasium* course the student is to have the choice between Greek and English; wherever local conditions make special attention to English in a *Gymnasium* desirable, this study is to be prescribed, from the seventh year to the end of the course, in the place of French, which will then become an elective; the final examination (*Abiturientenexamen*) is to be abolished as soon as possible; and the experiment with curricula like those of the *Reformgymnasien* of Frankfurt and Altona, which has so far proven success-

ful, is to be continued on a larger scale.

It will not be long now until the departments of medicine and law in the German universities will be opened to the graduates of the *Realgymnasien* and *Ober-Realschulen*; and there is but little to be said against such a measure. The *Abiturientenexamen* will not be missed; it has been pedagogically a failure, if not a positive detriment. But the shortening of the course in Greek, without a proportionate increase in the number of the recitations devoted to it, would be a most serious loss to the cause of classical studies; it is to be hoped that the wording of the edict, which is not very clear on this point, does not, as interpreted above, represent the Emperor's actual intentions.

IN *The Golden Book of Venice*,¹ which is entitled *A historical romance of the sixteenth century*, we have in reality a series of pictures, excellently drawn, of the life of Venice at the end of the sixteenth century. The admirable artistic appreciation of Venetian colour and magnificence, shown by the author, especially in the gorgeous descriptions of church and state festivals, is the chief recommendation of the work, and, by comparison with this attraction the interest of the story becomes slight. In addition to the artistic merit, however, the representation of the episodes in the history of the republic, which are embraced by the story, is exceedingly true and vivid: especially is this the case with regard to the crisis of the years 1606-7, when Venice lay under the interdict of Paul V. The figure of Fra Paolo Sarpi, of the order of the "Servi di Maria," both as youthful orator and leading diplomatist of Venice, is exceptionally striking and attractive.

¹ By Mrs. Lawrence Turnbull (New York, The Century Co., 1900).